

**Institutionalization vs. globalization:
Exploring the internal and external influences
on the Lifelong Learning policies of the
European Union.**

Pandis P.

UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING

Department: Institute Of Education

Faculty: Human Sciences

Name: Prokopios Pandis

Registration Number: 1222679

Degree of: Master of Philosophy

Title of Thesis: “Institutionalization vs. globalization: Exploring the internal and external influences on the lifelong learning policies of the European Union”

Oct, 2008

**“To the most wonderful people in this world, my parents,
Eleni & Odisseas, to whom I owe what I am today”.**

**«Στους πιο ξεχωριστούς ανθρώπους του κόσμου, στους
γονείς μου, Ελένη & Οδυσσέα, στους οποίους οφείλω ότι είμαι
σήμερα».**

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Mark Murphy, for devoting considerable amount of time in the guidance of this work. I appreciate his most valuable comments that inspired me throughout this eighteenth months' process until the completion of my thesis.

I would like to express my thanks to my friend, Eleni, for her emotional support and very good friendship. She helped me to overcome difficult situations, by making life seem easier but special at the same time. Eleni I owe you gratitude.

I would also like to thank Nikos Papadakis, for the inspiration, the guidance and the assistance who has offered me all that years that I am a student.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Odisseas & Eleni for being the driving force in my life and also my sister, Maria, who was always there when I needed her. I wish her the best in her life.

Abstract

The research explores the impact of both internal and external institutions on the development of European Union (EU) education policy and the extent of this impact, through the examination of the historic development of European education. In particular, the research attempts to assess the varying degree of influence of, on the one hand, EU institutions such as the European Commission and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and, on the other, external institutions such as the OECD and UNESCO.

Due to the exploratory nature of this research, a qualitative approach was considered to be the most appropriate, with a focus on mobility policy as a case study through which to explore the influence of these institutions. As a shared policy focus of these institutions, mobility policy lends itself more readily to exploratory analysis, allowing for a more focused examination of the manner in which the four institutions have impacted on development of European education policy. The empirical data was generated by means of seven semi-structured interviews.

The findings of the research tend to suggest a leading role for the European Commission in the development of European education. Moreover, they reveal the catalytic impact of the ECJ during the 1980s. In addition to that, the findings also reveal the, albeit relatively minor, important influence of external institutions in the historical development of European education. More significantly, the findings indicate the growing importance of external institutions, mainly the OECD, in the more recent policy developments in the field of European education

The analysis presented in the research has implications not only for studies of European policy making, but also has relevance for broader political science discussions regarding the varying roles of globalisation and institutions in shaping regional public policy.

Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
Chapter 1: Reviewing the literature	11
1.1. Introduction.....	11
1.2. Development of European education.....	12
1.3. Institutionalization vs. globalization.....	18
1.4. The institutionalization representatives	26
1.4.1. European Commission.....	26
1.4.2. The European Court of Justice.....	30
1.5. Globalization specimens	34
1.5.1 UNESCO	34
1.5.2. OECD.....	37
1.5.3. Shared policy proposals	41
1.6. Mobility at a glance: The SOCRATES programme	43
1.7. Summary	52
Chapter 2: Methodology	54
2.1 Rationale for research design.....	54
2.2 Research design	55
2.3 Research subjects.....	56
Chapter 3: Findings.....	59

3.1. Introduction.....	59
3.2. The mobility issue.....	60
3.2.1. ‘1971-1983’	61
3.2.2. ‘1983-1992’	68
3.2.3. ‘1992 - 1999’	73
3.2.4 ‘1999 – ’	78
3.3. Conclusion	86
Chapter 4: Analysis.....	89
4.1. Introduction.....	89
4.2. The development of EU’s educational policy.....	90
4.2.1. ‘1957-1971’	92
4.2.2. ‘1971-1983’	92
4.2.3. ‘1983-1992’	94
4.2.4. ‘1992-1999’	96
4.2.5. ‘1999 - nowadays’	98
4.3. Conclusion	101
Conclusion	104
Appendix.....	110
References.....	116

Introduction

Education policy in Europe has come a long way since the Treaty of Rome in 1957. In the Treaty of Rome, apart from a justifiable focus on vocational training, education was more or less absent. In the early 1970s education entered the policy arena and a new era began, education becoming a priority for action mainly because both member states and European institutions realized the importance of education for further European integration. It was deemed necessary for the European institutions to promote the ideas of a common Europe and European citizenship, in order to justify their actions in the economic field, and education, understandably, appeared to fit. Despite the fact that education came to the surface for apparently economic reasons it became one of the more important policies at the European level. Until the 1990s there was no real legal basis for European institutions to act in the field of education, this particular public policy being considered an exclusively national responsibility. With the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, this has partially changed. Post-Maastricht, European institutions found themselves with a basis for action in the national educational systems, but there was not much interference with them until the late 1990s (Smith, 2001).

Such a shift reflects a broader transformation in the field of EU public policy. Since the Treaty of Rome, most policies in this field have been altered in some way. Education followed that trend although with some delay compared to other public policies. In any case, member states have eventually conceded some responsibilities to the EU with a number of developments occurring as a result. Not surprisingly,

these developments at the European level have generated a great deal of academic debate and research. One debate that has dominated discussion over the process of EU integration is that between "institutionalists" and "globalists", who have diametrically opposed views as to the kinds of factors that have impacted on the development of European political integration (Moravcsik, 1991).

On one hand, institutionalists claim that the most decisive factors behind the development of European political integration are European institutions. According to them, European institutions were always the drivers as far as European developments are concerned, with EU institutions responsible for the construction of a common and integrated Europe. In particular, the European Commission, the executive body of the European Union, is perceived to be the key player re European integration. The Commission is divided into separate Directorate Generals, each one of them concerned with a different political or economic field. This is also the case with education. Even from the early 1980s, education obtained more institutional status in the Commission with the establishment of the Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Education. Since then, the Commission has become a significant co-player (with member states) in any educational policy development. Especially in the 1990s, the Commission produced numerous publications concerning education and in particular lifelong learning, which was the new trend in education since the 1970s, and these publications have decisively altered European education.

According to the institutionalists, another European institution with a paramount role in European integration is the European Court of Justice (ECJ), the rulings of the court being significant in the development of political and economic policies.

Historically, the ECJ has been a catalyst in the process of European integration opening all the time new avenues in other European institutions. That is the case in education too. The ECJ's ruling in the Gravier case, in 1985, provided the legal basis for the establishment of the Erasmus Programme. Furthermore, the ECJ, existing over and above the national courts, was able to impose its decisions without much resistance from member states.

On the other hand, globalists tend to claim that one cannot neglect external factors that have impacted on the development of European integration. They do not accept the view that European integration is a 'closed' procedure concerning only the member states and European institutions. Globalization has created a new environment, mainly from the 1980s and onwards, and has contributed to mass changes in both the political and economic field of Europe as well as the rest of the globe.

While such debate is useful, there has not been a great deal of focus on the role of *international institutions* in this debate, institutions in this debate only focussing on 'domestic' institutions, such as the EC and the ECJ. According to institutionalists these two institutions are the most important factors in the development of European education. The purpose of the present study is to explore the influence of institutions in general, including OECD and UNESCO, which are the main specimens of globalization in the field of education. The current study uses 'mobility' as a case study in order to explore the influence of these institutions on the development of education policy.

Aims and objectives

The main aims of this research are:

- 1. To explore if, indeed, both internal and external institutions have impacted on the development of European educational policy and if that is the case,**
- 2. To what extent these institutions have influenced the EU's educational policy.**

A number of objectives are set for the achievement of this aim which are:

1. Undertaking a literature review, in order to gather data on both internal and external institutions and their relation with EU's educational policy.
2. The use of 'mobility' as a case study, in order to specify the research.
3. The field work, including data collection, mainly from interviews with policy makers in the EU.
4. Analysis and generalization of the findings from the research and the literature review.

Significance of the research

Usually, research in education, and the social sciences in general, aims at the 'better understanding of the facts and the relations (which concern their fields) in order (the

concerning persons) to be able to act and act “better” than they did before’ (Langeveld 1965, cited in Bell, 1999: 16). Whatever the size and the scope of the research, the researcher analyzes and evaluates the data they collect and can then make suggestions for actions which will bring about changes in policy and/or improvements in practise (Bell, 1999). In today’s literature it is recognized that educational research, politics and decision-making are inextricably intertwined. That means there is an inescapable political dimension to educational research. Nowadays, European integration is a major research issue, and this is not surprising, as it includes numerous policies and a great degree of consolidation of the member states in these policies creating a new field for research.

Research in matters concerning European integration can move political and economic agendas forward providing new benchmarks, evidences and opinions for actions which will bring changes in structures or improvements in policies. While there is a great amount of research concerning European education, not a great deal of research has been done on the impact of institutions in the development of European education. The existing research focuses on the influence of European institutions while ignoring the existence of external institutions like the OECD and UNESCO. This research attempts to clarify what is the contribution of institutions, both internal and external, in the development of the EU’s educational policy while also contributing to the theoretical discussion on the ‘conflict’ between institutionalists and globalists.

For the purpose of this research the ‘mobility’ policy will be used as a case study. The findings on this specific policy will be later generalized, where feasible, in order to

cover the broader context of education. The use of a case study is essential for this research since it will provide more specific conclusions on the influence of organizations in the development of the EU's educational policy. The conduct of this research will include: the use of primary and secondary sources, data collection methods and in particular interviews, and finally, data analysis and presentation of the results. The primary and secondary sources will be used mainly in the literature review to explore the documentary relation between the relevant organizations and EU education policy.

The main part of the research takes place in Brussels, where a number of EU's policy makers are interviewed. These interviews are semi-structured in order to be more flexible. Finally, in the data analysis an attempt will be made to combine the findings of the literature review and of the interviews as well as to generalize these findings. It should be mentioned here that the administering of questionnaires is a rather insufficient method for this research due to the nature of the topic and because the focal point of this research is Brussels, which makes the distribution and collection of questionnaires a somewhat difficult procedure.

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that because of the constrained time and resources there are several limitations in our research. First of all, it was not possible to get interviews with all the desirable people. Some significant policy makers could not be interviewed and that is a drawback for the research. Of course, the purpose is to conduct as many interviews as possible and mainly from important 'stakeholders'. Moreover, as the European Union is the focus of the research there will not be interviews from representatives of external institutions. Due to the fact that the

Commission's headquarters for education are in Brussels more than one trip is needed, for data collection and interviews, but resources will not allow more than two, which makes the research even more constrained. Moreover, one should consider the fact that European education is changing day by day so it is sometimes difficult to follow new developments. That said this research is as up-to-date as possible. Finally, one should consider the lack of literature on this particular topic, which is a limitation by itself.

We propose lifelong learning as the master concept for educational policies in the years to come for both developed and developing countries.

LEARNING TO BE, UNESCO 1972

Education is an investment that can help foster economic growth, contribute to personal and social development and reduce social inequality. Like any investment, it involves both costs and returns. Some of the returns are monetary and directly related to the labour market, while others are personal, social, cultural and more broadly economic. Some returns accrue to the individual while others benefit society in general, for example, in the form of a more literate and productive population.

EDUCATION AT A GLANCE, OECD 1996

The future of European culture depends on its capacity to equip young people to question constantly and seek new answers without prejudicing human values.

WHITE PAPER, EUROPEAN COMMISSION 1995

Chapter 1: Reviewing the literature

1.1. Introduction

In the introduction of this research a number of aims and objectives were set. The literature review, which is one of the objectives, will help in understanding the general framework of the research. Through the literature review a number of issues are examined separately in order to clarify some of the research topics and a preliminary analysis on the impact of institutions in the development of European education will be made. For this to happen two main objectives have been set:

- The first one is to briefly present the development of European education since the beginning of ‘common’ Europe in 1957 until now. This will make it easier to explore and analyse various factors that have impacted on EU educational policy development as well as the extent of this impact.
- The second objective is a first statement of the discussion on two rival trends in contemporary political science, namely *institutionalization* and *globalization*. This debate is dominant in current political discourse, even from the beginning of European involvement in education policy of member states. These trends have at least two main manifestations concerning European education, and both sides of the debate claim greater impact on the development of European education.

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to present in more detail what exactly are the characteristics of each trend as well as which exactly are the main representatives of each one. Additionally a brief historical review will be made of the representatives' actions concerning European education. But first of all, and before entering the main body of the research it is necessary to explore the development of European education historically, which will provide a guide for the rest of the research.

1.2. Development of European education

Compared with other more well-established policy domains in the EU, educational policy is relatively underdeveloped and could even be said to be a 'poor relation' in the family of EU policies. The 1957 Treaty of Rome did not refer to education. According to Field, 'the new phrases in the Treaty of Rome which referred to vocational training were little more than gestures, provoking neither objections nor enthusiasm. Initially, Community policy on education and training was largely symbolic'. Nevertheless, since the early 1970s, EU educational initiatives have slowly but surely increased in numbers (Field, 1994: 17-18). In the following decades (1980s, 1990s) European institutions took the lead in policy proposals and European education become eventually a priority for action reaching gradually from 'silence' to 'consolidation'.

According to Professor Whitehead, the history of the development of education policy in the EU can be characterized in five stages¹:

- 1957-1971 – “near silence”;

¹ In Whitehead, M. *Educational policy and the European Union: An introduction*. Hull, Eurotext Project, 2000.

- 1971-1983 – foundation-laying;
- 1983-1992 – expansion;
- 1992-2000 – consolidation;
- 2000-2006 – translating policy into practice.

1957-1971: “near silence”

While the Treaty of Rome did not contain any specific mention of the development of educational policy, certain articles of that treaty did address the following education-related principles and issues:

- the promotion of freedom of movement of workers for the purpose of employment (Art.48);
- the creation of a common programme to encourage the exchange of young workers (Art. 50);
- the promotion of closer co-operation among member states with regard to basic and advanced vocational training, or “occupational and continuing training” (Art. 118), as it was then termed.
- Outlines for the creation of a common vocational training policy (Art. 128).

Little was in put in place to foster these ideals until 1971.

1971-1983: foundation-laying

At their July 1971 meeting, the Council of Ministers drew up guidelines for the creation of a Community-level programme with regard to vocational training; and at the 1972 Paris Summit, education was included for the first time within the remit of

one of the (then) thirteen commissioners. The publication in 1973 of the Janne report, under the chairmanship of the former Belgian minister of education, Professor Henri Janne, marked a turning point in a period of over fifteen years of “near silence” on the question of education.

The Janne report identified a number of areas for development that have concerned, and continue to concern, policy makers and educators across the EU today. These include:

- The introduction and promotion of a European dimension in education;
- The promotion of knowledge and learning of languages of other member states;
- The fostering of educational exchanges and the mutual recognition of degrees and diplomas;
- Educational co-operation;
- Permanent education.

While the Janne report stressed the need for greater ‘coherence’ in the educational domain within the Community, it was recognized that there could be no question of interference from the Community in the educational policies of individual member states. These principles were recognized in the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of Education on 9 February 1976. Moreover, an early manifestation of greater coherence was the establishing in 1975 of CEDEFOP - the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training - an organization designed to promote the exchange of information in this area. These initiatives were further complemented in 1980 by the creation of the EURYDICE network to promote the exchange of

information on national educational systems and policies in member states, as well as on Community-level action in the field of education.

1983-1992: expansion

These early foundations provided the bases for subsequent further development and expansion, most notably in the period 1983-1992. The momentum of development quickened particularly following the 1985 judgement of the European Court in the Gravier case, when vocational training was deemed to fall within the competence of the European Commission. Progress from the making of intergovernmental resolutions to the making of binding Community decisions on education and training, while respecting the principal of subsidiarity, was at last possible.

During the 1980s, there was a growing realization that a successful European Community could not be based exclusively on the promotion of ideas and actions concerning economic and political integration outside the realms of education. The Stuttgart and Fontainebleau Declarations of 1983 and 1984 did much to foster the notion of European citizenship and these were reinforced by the 1985 Resolution on a People's Europe. For educationists in the Community involved in day-to-day contact with students, the *Resolution of the Council of Ministers on the European Dimension in education*, of 24 May 1988, was a significant document. Together with the 1991 *Memorandum on higher education in the European Community*, it helped map the way for further, rapid developments in Community programmes in the field of education, training and youth. By the end of this period, such programmes, each of which had a specific aim, were numerous. Some of them were:

- ERASMUS – student mobility and co-operation in higher education;
- EUROTECNET – vocational training in the new technologies;
- FORCE – and action programme for the development of continuing vocational training in the European Community;
- LINGUA – to promote foreign-language competence in the European Community
- PETRA – provision of at least one year's vocational education for young people on completion of compulsory education;
- YOUTH FOR EUROPE – an exchange programme for young people outside of formal education.

1992-2000: consolidation

The 1992 Treaty on European Union marked a turning point in educational policy at the European level, recognizing education for the first time as an official area of Community responsibility and linking it with culture, again for the first time. Two of the articles of the Treaty can be consider as a unity:

- Article 126 (now 149 following the consolidation of the Treaties after the signature and ratification of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997), referring to education in general and
- Article 127 (now 150), referring to the implementation of a vocational training policy.

In both cases, the treaty is careful to emphasize the fact that EU policy in these domains is intended to supplement and support the actions of member states, while fully respecting their national responsibilities and national cultural and linguistic

diversities. The first manifestation of the consolidation of the educational ideals set out in the 1992 treaty was revealed in the 1993 Green Paper on “*The European Dimension in Education*”. This gave member states an opportunity to consider the direction of future educational policy at the EU level and to reflect on the ways in which such policy might interact with existing and future educational policies at the national level.

The 1993 Green Paper provided some motivation for programmes like LEONARDO da VINCI and the SOCRATES I, but mainly engendered a number of new educational documents:

- The 1995 White Paper, *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning society* – the major EU educational document of the 1990s – which was followed up with an *implementation document*;
- The December 1996 report of the EU study group on education and training, *Accomplishing Europe through education and training*;
- The October’s 1996 Green Paper, *Education-training-research: the obstacles to transnational mobility*;
- *Learning in the Information Society: action plan for a European education initiative (1996-1998)* in 1996 and
- *Towards a Europe of Knowledge*, in 1997.

Finally, it could be said that key concepts assumed greater importance in the late 1990s: the knowledge society and *lifelong learning* took over as a key focus for the European Commission in particular with regard to its policy proposals and discussion documents produced (O’Mahony, 2003: 12).

Policy into practice, 2000-2006

The decade from 1990-2000 witnessed major development of education and training across the EU. The major challenge currently is to build on earlier achievements and learn lessons from earlier failures – and to turn the many policy documents of the 1990s on education, training and research into effective practice. To assist in this, a new generation of programmes has been launched for the period 2000-2006: SOCRATES, LEONARDO DA VINCI, YOUTH, TEMPUS III (Whitehead, 2000: 6).

Having provided a brief review of the development of European education an attempt will be made to analyze the two main rival political trends - institutionalization and globalization – which are in the focus of this research, and to explore their impact on the development of European educational policy.

1.3. Institutionalization vs. globalization

The core concepts utilized in this research are *globalization* and *institutionalization*. Appropriated from the realms of political and social science, they offer up the parameters of a paradigm within which the current research can explore the internal and external influences on European education policy. Both concepts are quite complex, with a variety of meanings attached, depending on the author in question. The purpose of this section is not to get too entangled in the debates of other

disciplines, but rather to utilise certain relevant aspects as a way of understanding the role and relevance of various institutions in EU education.

To start with, it should be obvious to most commentators that globalization has become a ‘key idea’ in both academic research and popular culture. According to Rizvi (2004: 157) “over the past decade, there has been no other concept in social, political and educational theory as widely and passionately debated as globalization. Not only has globalization become a buzzword, it has also divided theorists and practitioners alike along highly ideological lines”. Deep disputes have emerged surrounding the historical and cultural origins of globalization, as well as its political consequences. Little consensus exists with respect to not only definitions and explanations of globalization but also its implications for policy, and prescriptions for a ‘new world order’. Globalization has been linked to almost every purported social change in recent years, from an emergent knowledge economy, the declining authority of the state and the demise of traditional cultural practices to the spread of neo-liberal economic regimes and the advent of a postmodern consumer culture. Some have viewed globalization as a major new source for optimism in the world, while others have seen it in entirely negative terms. As Scholte (2000, in Rizvi 2004: 158) points out, “some people have associated ‘globalization’ with progress, prosperity and peace. For others, however, the word has conjured up deprivation, disaster and doom” – a division named by Held and McGrew (2000) as that between the ‘hyperglobalisers’ and the ‘skeptics’.

Globalization is proving to be a confusing experience in many ways for almost every actor involved in the process, whether this actor is a nation-state, an international

organization or simply an individual. “One major reason that many fear globalization is the ambiguity inherent to the term. Although few hesitate to use it, most would not be able to offer an answer to the simple questions of ‘What is globalization?’ and ‘What does globalization mean for the actors involved?’” (Jansen & Bücherl, 1998: 5).

According to Jarvis (1999: 249), globalization is fundamentally “an economic phenomenon, the effects of which spread from the West throughout the whole of the culture of society – of which education forms but one part”. On the other hand, Held and McGrew (1999: 16) believe that “globalization should be seen as a complex, multi dimensional process rather than a primarily economic phenomenon”. They suggest that it should be conceptualized as “a process which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and exercise of power”.

While differences exist over definitions of globalization, there is also disagreement over its origins. According to Dale (1999:3) the phenomenon of globalization, “emerged from the particular set of circumstances that attended the decline of the post-war economic and political settlement, that centred on the set of international financial agreements and institutions known collectively as the Bretton Woods agreement”.

According to Gray (2002), however, globalization must be seen as a trans-historical phenomenon taking different ‘historical forms’ from pre-modern times to the present. It goes back at least as far as the last third of the nineteenth century, when transatlantic telegraph cables were first laid down. Driven by technologies that abolish or curtail time and distance in many areas of activity, it is a by-product of the growth of scientific knowledge. The global free market constructed in the last decade of the twentieth century is only one of the several regimes under which globalization has advanced for well over a century (Gray, 2002).

With these various debates concerning definition and origin, it is correct to state, as Mario Telo (1998: 21) does, that globalization represents a “challenge” for the social sciences. However, although it is easy to overstate the speed and intensity of economic globalization, it is important, according to Jones (1998: 146), to appreciate its impact to date, particularly in relation to the nation state. Kristen Sukalac (1998: 104) claims that it is “increasingly difficult for any national social model to weather the rigors of globalization”, while Bücherl (1998: 95) argues that globalization “inevitably transfers power and decision-making competence away from the democratic nation state and its citizens to merely a few obscure institutions in transnational business and politics”. Of course, there are opponents of this view, for example Fortuny (1998: 105), who states that globalization should not be seen as a “supranational paradigm that has largely usurped national policy autonomy”. (See also Dale, 1999 and Olssen, 2004).

Regardless of which side of the nation-state/globalization debate is more accurate, a key question for the current research is the relative influence of globalization on education policies generally. In this regard, Dale (1999: 2) makes an interesting point when he states that, “while it is widely acknowledged that globalization does affect national policies in a range of areas, precisely how is rarely questioned, let alone analyzed.” According to Marginson (1999), one of the possible reasons why there is not much in the way of analysis, is due to the complex relationship between education policy and globalization. “Though modern education systems are creatures of the nation-building project, a project which, in its high modern post-1945 form, is rendered increasingly problematic in a global order, education itself also operates as one of the subject-objects of globalization” (Marginson, 1999: 19).

Given that the relationship between globalization and education policy is complex and difficult to assess, it was felt that a useful way in which to gauge the impact of globalization was to focus particularly on a set of ‘agents’ of globalization, in this case, two institutions in the shape of UNESCO and the OECD. Before these two global institutions are described in more detail, it is necessary to explore the other core concept in this research – *institutionalization*.

While maybe not as developed a concept as that of globalization, the debate over institutionalization is just as complex and contentious. It also should be noted here that the concept is sometimes used interchangeably with *institutional analysis* or *institutionalism*. For the purposes of the current study, institutionalization will be

preferred. Generally it refers to a focus on institutions as the key drivers of change, rather than say national governments or forces of globalization.

As with globalization, there are disagreements over the desired approach to institutional analysis. According to Schmidt (1999) there are three approaches through which institutionalism can be explained each one with very different objects and goals. "Rational choice institutionalism focuses on intentional, interest-motivated action and seeks to make universal generalizations or predictions about what rational actors will do within a given set of institutions, seen as structures of incentives. Historical institutionalism concentrates instead on the origins and development of the institutions themselves, seen as institutional structures and processes, which are explained by the (often unintended) outcomes of purposeful choices and historically unique initial conditions" (Schmidt, 1999: 1). "Sociological institutionalism concerns itself with culturally framed actions, ideas, and identities that follow from culturally-specific rules and norms. These may or may not be "rational" in the stricter rational choice sense or predictable by way of universal generalizations, although they may be "expectable" within a given cultural context" (Schmidt, 1999: 2). The three approaches also have very different standards of evaluation, with the sociological approach referring to the "logic of appropriateness," the historical approach following the "logic of path-dependence," and the rationalist approach invoking the "logic of interest."

These three approaches are methodologically distinct enterprises, each with a different set of insights into political reality, each with different limitations.

“Rational choice institutionalism works best at identifying the interests and motivations behind rational actors’ behavior within given institutional settings. The deductive nature of its approach to explanation means that it not only is tremendously helpful at capturing the range of reasons actors would normally have for any given action within a given institutional incentive structure and at predicting likely outcomes, but also at bringing out anomalies or actions that are unexpected given the general theory” (Schmidt 1999: 2).

“Historical institutionalism, by contrast, “tends to emphasize sequences in development, timing of events, and phases of political change. Interests, moreover, rather than being universally defined, are contextual” (Zysman, Thelen in Schmidt 1999: 2).

Sociological institutionalism, finally, “works best at delineating the shared understandings and norms that frame action, shape identities, influence interests, and affect what are perceived as problems and what are conceived as solutions. Rather than being too general, it is sometimes accused of being too specific, and the ‘cultural knowledge’ it provides is useful mainly as preliminary to rational choice universalization” (Schmidt 1999: 3). Each of the three institutionalisms, thus, offers a different perspective on political reality, each with different objects, goals, and standards of explanation, each with different advantages and disadvantages.

Regardless of which of the three are preferred, however, when it comes to Europe, they all share a belief that the main focus should be on the “institutional structure of the EU” (Tsebelis, 1999: 5). A good example of such an approach is provided by Lehmann & Schunz (2005: 6) who claim that the institutional approach contributes most to the analysis of the day-to-day evolution of European policy-making, for the simple reason that “Treaty rules regarding the manner in which the Community institutions arrive at their decisions are not at the disposal of the Member States”.

For the purposes of this study, the key ‘agents’ of institutionalization are the European Commission and the European Court of Justice, and these will be described in more detail in the next section. Of course, and as is the case with the agents of globalisation, other institutions could have been chosen, for example the European Parliament. In this case, the use of certain institutions is selective. It is important to emphasize that other institutions, including for example universities, also have a role to play in affecting change. This became clear for example with the Bologna Declaration where universities were key players. It is also the case that much has been written about the impact of globalization on higher education (see Coulby, 2004 and Jarvis, 1999 for examples). However, it should also become apparent in the next section as to why these particular institutions were chosen for the purpose of this study.

1.4. The institutionalization representatives

1.4.1. European Commission

The European Commission, the executive body of the European Union, is the nearest thing to a 'supranational' government that has been devised so far in the process of European integration. This gives it an advantage over international agencies in that its remit is more prescriptive and its membership more concentrated, which allows the Commission to mount large-scale projects in countries backed by substantial financial incentives and the political commitments that go with Union membership (Papadopoulos, 2003). Education is not new to the European Union. What is new is the strategic importance it has now come to occupy in the broader social, employment and economic objectives of Union policies.

Since the 1960's action in education and training focused on co-operation, exchange of experience, support for innovation, and the development and co-ordination of training policies. It also boosted industry-education co-operation and the mobility of students and people in training. The turning point came in 1993, with the adoption of the EC's White Paper (European Commission, 1993) on *Growth, Competitiveness and Employment*, which stressed that the development of education and training is one of the conditions for a new model of more employment-intensive growth. Coupled with increasing consensus within the Union on the need to increase and consolidate educational activity, the 1993 White Paper led to two new initiatives: setting out, in the form of guidelines for action, detailed proposals designed to serve as a basis for the Commission's policy in education and training – presented in a new White Paper

on *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society* (1995); and the decision by the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament (October 1995) to designate 1996 the European Year of Lifelong Learning.

Both initiatives were aimed at provoking debate at every level on the need for lifelong learning, in order to sensitize Europeans to upheavals brought about by the advent of the information society, the process of internationalization and scientific and technical progress, and to the potential contribution of education and training towards meeting this challenge. The gist of the White Paper was in its guidelines for action, which were to shape European Union work over the next two years. These were grouped under the following five general objectives: (a) encouraging the acquisition of new knowledge – recognition of skills; mobility; multimedia educational software; (b) bringing schools and the business sector closer together – apprenticeship-trainee schemes and vocational training; (c) combating exclusion – second-chance school and European voluntary service; (d) ensuring proficiency in three community languages; and (e) treating capital investment and investment in training on an equal basis (European Commission, 1995). The pursuit of these objectives was propagated and tested out in the massive programme of activities organized during the European Year of Lifelong Learning.

Thus, the Union set itself on the road to lifelong learning, an objective which was incorporated in the Amsterdam treaty expressing determination to promote high levels of knowledge through broad access to education and its permanent updating. The stage was set for the final act – guidelines for future European Union action in the

areas of education, training and youth for the period 2000 to 2006, presented in the 1997 White Paper: *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* (European Commission, 1997).

In the White Paper three dimensions of European educational area are emphasized:

- Knowledge: In order to be able to take an active part in the current processes of change, the citizens of Europe will be able to develop their fund of knowledge continually, thus expanding and renewing it on a lasting basis (European Commission, 1997).
- Citizenship: this educational area will facilitate an enhancement of citizenship through the sharing of common values, and the development of a sense of belonging to a common social and cultural area. It must encourage a broader-based understanding of citizenship, founded on active solidarity and on mutual understanding of the cultural diversities that constitute Europe's originality and richness (European Commission, 1997).

“Citizenship is not simply a collection of behavioural principles founded on common values and norms. If the aim is to lend citizenship an identifiable content, one that people will want put into to practices, then we must go further. Citizenship is a multi faceted-idea: it is to be understood as a social practice, as a normative idea, and as a relational practice. It also has democratic, egalitarian, intercultural and ecological dimensions” (European Commission, 1996a).

- Competence: developing employability through the acquisition of competencies made necessary through changes in work and its organizations. This means that it is necessary to promote on a lifelong basis creativity, flexibility, adaptability, the

ability to ‘learn to learn’ and to solve problems. These are the conditions we must meet in order to overcome the now rapid obsolescence of skills. Activities must be developed which help towards anticipating needs and towards the evolution of job profiles (European Commission, 1997).

Moreover, the European Commission in the 1996 Communication entitled *Education-training-research: the obstacles to trans-national mobility*, refers specifically to the advantages of mobility in terms of education, training and research. Mobility is one of the main goals concerning the concept of lifelong learning. According to the EU,

“personal mobility is a vital element of the European Community’s investment in human resources, which is seen as one of the keys to successfully meeting the economic, social and cultural challenges of the 21st century. This mobility is encouraged by the Commission through a variety of programmes for the trans-national mobility of persons who are keen to undergo training, broaden their horizons or contribute to training activities in another Member State of the Community” (European Commission, 1996d).

One of the most recent publications of EC is the *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning*. In the consultation which followed it six essential elements were identified for coherent and comprehensive lifelong learning strategies:

- *Partnership working*, not only between decision-making levels but also between public authorities and education service providers, the business sector and the social partners, vocational guidance services, research centres, etc.

- *Insight into the demand for learning* in the knowledge-based society – which will entail redefining basic skills, to include for instance the new information and communication technologies
- *Adequate resourcing*, involving a substantial increase in public and private investment in learning.
- *Facilitating access to learning opportunities* by making them more visible, introducing new provision and removing obstacles to access.
- *Creating a learning culture* by giving learning a higher profile, both in terms of image and by providing incentives for the people most reticent to opt for learning.
- *Striving for excellence* through the introduction of quality control and indicators to measure progress.

It is interesting, here, to note that in looking at the evolution of EU commitment to lifelong learning, there has been a shift from the initial heavily economic rationale to one that takes on social concerns as well. This is clearly observed in the differences between the 1995 and the 1997 White Papers (Papadopoulos, 2003). According to the European Commission “the debate increasingly accepts that lifelong learning is exactly that: it begins in the cradle and ends at the grave, embracing democratic participation, personal fulfillment/ recreational learning, and the ageing process in addition to economic and employment imperatives” (European Commission, 1999).

1.4.2. The European Court of Justice

Existing literature has already highlighted the ‘political power’ of the European Court of Justice (Alter, 1996; 1998) as well as the capacity of the European Commission

(Schmidt, 2000) to produce unintended consequences by acting autonomously (Dimitrakopoulos, 2001: 108). Put another way, if the Commission is the ‘guardian’ of the Treaty the European Court of Justice (ECJ) is its ‘interpreter’ (Dimitrakopoulos, 2001). Commission’s primary function is initiation and ECJ’s is interpretation. These functions signify participation in alternative processes of rule creation. While the Commission participates in the political process of policy-making, whereby new legislation is adopted, the ECJ operates in the judicial process of interpretation, whereby already existing law is further explicated.

‘Since the 1950s the ECJ has made extensive use of the so-called ‘teleological method’ of interpretation of European law. This method relies on the Court’s own – that is, autonomously defined – conception of the objectives of the Treaty as a guideline for the interpretation of ambiguous legal provisions and has become part of the ECJ’s standard operating procedures’ (Dimitrakopoulos, 2001: 113).

The ECJ’s role cannot be considered in isolation from the role of the Commission. The latter constitutes a source of cases that reach the ECJ while it also monitors their subsequent implementation and frequently uses such cases as a stimulus for the (re-) formulation of policy (Dimitrakopoulos, 2001).

According to Tallberg (2000: 847)

‘at the heart of the distinction between initiating new and interpreting existing rules is the question of mobilization. Whereas

the Commission must convince EU governments of the appropriateness of the legislation it proposes, the ECJ need not mobilize Member States to introduce new rules through its case law. The requirement of mobilization grants Member States a form of participation-based monitoring with regard to the Commission, while the ECJ is only subject to observation-based monitoring. The term ‘participation-based’ points to governments’ ability to observe and actively intervene in the execution of an action, whereas ‘observation-based’ signifies the ability to observe an action without the possibility to force a change of outcomes in the process’.

This observation-based monitoring of the Member States in the ECJ in no way indicates direct involvement in its decision-making. Even if member governments may signal their preferences by submitting observations and arguing their cases before the ECJ, they cannot prevent it from handing down a particular judgement.

The Member states retain the right to alter the supranational decisions. It is significant that policy can be changed through new legislation in which legal interpretation would be of little value if it could easily be altered. In this way member governments can always interfere in the Commission’s decisions. In the case of the ECJ, however, only decisions based on secondary legislation can be reversed by enacting new legislation. The only way to reverse a ruling based on primary law is by revising the Treaties. That is why the ECJ can implement an agenda that cannot be altered by member states. The ECJ acts more autonomously and is more sheltered from intrusive

government control than the Commission, and enjoys means of influence permitting more independent rule-creation (Tallberg, 2000: 848).

With no means of intrusive monitoring, national governments were unable to prevent the ECJ from establishing the principle. The ECJ's function as supreme interpreter of EC law relieves the institution from intrusive control mechanisms and provides it with means of independent rule creation, making it comparatively easier for it to act autonomously. Equipped with the political mandate to act as the spearhead of integration, the Commission, by contrast, must mobilize Member States to implement its own agenda, and is subject to an elaborate system of control mechanisms (Tallberg, 2000: 861).

From the above mentioned it should be apparent that much interaction has occurred between the two main European institutions and education policy. The ECJ has played an important role in all fields of European integration and its ruling was crucial in the development of European education policy. More specifically the Casagrande and Gravier cases (1974 and 1985 respectively) have constituted the cornerstone for developments in European education, and in particular in lifelong learning, from the renaissance of the idea (in the early 1970s) to today. These two cases were the catalyst for a quite different European approach of education, and they provide a kind of legal basis for the Commission to pursue an educational agenda. The ruling in the Gravier case connected higher education and vocational training contributed to a change in European perceptions of education matters.

1.5. Globalization specimens

1.5.1 UNESCO

While the history of adult education did not begin with UNESCO's world conferences, it is nonetheless true that, since its inception in 1946, UNESCO has come to be an adult education institution with the world as its stage. In the words of a Director-General of UNESCO, 'in a sense the whole UNESCO programme bears directly or indirectly, upon adult education'² (Bhola, 1988).

Lifelong learning became a policy of UNESCO in the 1970s. It was then that the first UNESCO's report on lifelong learning (Lengrand, 1970) was published, which was followed by the creation of the International Commission on the Development of Education under the chairmanship of Edgar Faure. The Commission's report was published under the title "*Learning to be: The world of Education Today and Tomorrow*" (Faure et al., 1972). According to the Faure report, education in its normative sense of providing 'worthwhile' knowledge, can enable persons to become beings in process, 'incomplete' beings in the process of becoming in 'an unending process of completion and learning' (Faure et al, in Borg and Mayo, 2005: 206). As a public statement on the principles of lifelong education the Faure report was a turning point. On the whole, it would be true to say that *Learning to Be*, couched as it was in general and conceptual terms, served more as a source of inspiration than a guide to practical action. Its impact on opinion should not be underestimated; nor should the

² Adult education, substantially, is nothing else than a part of lifelong learning.

stimulus it gave to launching specific programmes related to the concept of lifelong learning, particularly literacy and adult education programmes (Papadopoulos, 2003).

One key feature of UNESCO's approach is to view education in its totality³. It covers formal, non-formal and informal patterns of education, and attempts to integrate and articulate all structures and stages of education along the vertical (temporal) and horizontal (spatial) dimensions. It is also characterized by flexibility in time, place, content and techniques of learning and hence calls for self-directed learning, sharing of one's enlightenment with others, and adopting varied learning styles and strategies. Further, "the three major prerequisites considered as important for realizing the goals of lifelong education are: learning opportunity, motivation and educability. The goals include the fulfillment of adaptive and creative functions of the individuals leading to the continuous improvement of the quality of personal and collective life" (UIE, 1976: 184), a variant of humanist philosophy generally being associated with UNESCO's approach.

The Faure's report claimed that lifelong learning must be based on the individual's innate desire to learn, thereby leading to a more humane society for all. Its humanistic concern was with achieving the 'fulfillment of man' through flexible organization of the different stages of education, through widening access to higher levels of education, through recognition of informal and non-formal as well as formal learning, and through what were then new curriculum concerns such as health education, cultural education and environmental education (Field, 2001). In 1976 UNESCO's

³ According to UNESCO lifelong education is not confined to adult education but it encompasses and unifies all stages of education – pre-primary, primary, secondary and so forth. Thus it seeks to view education in its totality.

publication for the foundations of lifelong education is a typical example of its humanistic approach. “We can only hope that in future man will no longer be treated as a factor of production or service but as an individual developing according to the principles of lifelong education” (UNESCO, 1976).

One generation after *Learning to Be* the exercise was repeated, along almost identical lines. This time an International Commission, chaired by Jacques Delors, was charged with reporting on ‘Education for the Twenty-first Century’ – a weighty assignment matched by the title of the resulting report *Learning: The Treasure Within* (Delors, 1996). Compared with its predecessor, the Delors report, while fully endorsing the humanistic values and objectives of education, represents some significant departures in its analysis of problems and proposals for their solution in line with the changed socio-economic and political context in which education now operates – particularly the impact of globalization, technology and increasingly knowledge-based economies (Papadopoulos, 2003). As with its predecessor, the Delors report has been generally endorsed and has given rise to much discussion within individual countries and in regional conferences. Today UNESCO’s long term objective is to develop a comprehensive system of education and training for peace, human rights and democracy, international understanding and tolerance, embracing all levels of education, both formal and non-formal (UNESCO, 2000).

While these publications are two among many over the years, they should provide a flavour of the approach adopted by UNESCO. Alongside publications, UNESCO has an important role to play in the planning and delivery of education, particularly via its Europe-based specialized institutes, which are:

- UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE)
- UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
- UNESCO Institute of Education (UIE), and
- UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE).

The UNESCO Institute for Education in Hamburg has focused its energy on lifelong learning and has made some important contributions to adult education by focusing attention on the planning, administration and evaluation of adult literacy. UIE also focuses on adult learning, literacy and non-formal education in the perspective of lifelong learning across borders, regions, cultures and age.

Despite all these publications and all the undeniable efforts that have been made, no one really knows what the real impact UNESCO had on the EU's educational policy and more specifically on lifelong learning policy.

1.5.2. OECD

In the 1970s, it was not only UNESCO that promoted the idea of lifelong learning/education, but also the OECD, although the latter tended to place emphasis on recurrent education as a strategy for promoting lifelong education (Tuijnman & Bostrom, 2002: 99). Recurrent education is less of an all-embracing concept than lifelong education since it 'came to be associated with policies for the promotion of formal adult education (Tuijnman & Bostrom, 2002: 99). OECD stated in the early 1970's that

“one of the strongest common assumptions in most Western societies is that education is the key to upward mobility. This common belief in the efficacy of education as a means of individual social advancement has been combined with a growing social consensus that education should be used broadly as an instrument for social change, i.e. a large scale opening principal, or even the principal, instrument for the transformation and progressive modernization of societies” (OECD, 1971: 15).

In the same period the OECD was pinpointing a few key aspects to educational structures of ‘tomorrow’: (a) no binding of any individual at any time; (b) educational incentives for everybody; (c) compensatory efforts; (d) recurrent education; (e) selection mechanisms; and (f) reforms of contents of education (OECD, 1971). In the light of these ideas the OECD launched its Recurrent Education strategy in 1973, which it sustained for over a decade. Central to the strategy was spreading educational opportunities over an individual’s lifetime, to be available when needed rather than concentrated in initial ineffective education (Papadopoulos, 2003). A key reason for such an approach was the possibility of bringing together initial formal education and adult and on-the-job training into a single framework, thus enabling education and training to be attuned to the real needs of both the labour market and individuals (OECD, 2000).

“What the exact relationship of educational investment to economic growth is no one can yet say with assurance. The impression seems justified that investment in education is a significant factor in

economic progress. No responsible policy-maker would seriously doubt the importance of the relationship between education and economic policies” (OECD, 1971).

This statement is indicative of the perception held by the OECD regarding the value of education, and this economically driven agenda has not changed much since. This can be witnessed in the more recent emphasis placed on human capital theory and more specifically on the exploitation of human resources. It comes as no surprise then, that the OECD believes education to be an “investment in human skills that can foster economic growth” (OECD, 1996).

Current OECD work on lifelong learning is in many respects a continuation – but also a significant extension – of the recurrent education paradigm. At their 1990 meeting, OECD ministers of education concentrated their attention on the need to improve the quality of education at all levels and for all in society (OECD, 1992), while the subject of their 1995 meeting was ‘Making Lifelong Learning a Reality for All’ (OECD, 1996). The shift in emphasis between meetings was significant. While the central objective, high-quality education and training for all, remained the same, the concern in 1996 was with how to give reality to this objective – the answer being by adopting strategies for lifelong learning as the organizing principle for guiding education and training policies, and introducing practical measures to give effect to such strategies (Papadopoulos, 2003).

The OECD identified four key issues crucial to the successful realization of such strategies. These are: (a) strengthening the foundations for learning throughout life by

improving access to early childhood education, revitalizing schools and supporting the growth of other formal and non-formal learning arrangements; (b) promoting coherent links between learning and work by establishing pathways and bridges that facilitate more flexible movement between education-training and work, and by improving the mechanisms for accessing and recognizing the skills and competences of individuals, whether acquired through formal or non-formal learning; (c) rethinking the role and the responsibilities of all partners, including governments, who provide opportunities for learning; and (d) creating incentives – for individuals, employers and other education and training providers – to mobilize greater investment in lifelong learning opportunities (OECD, 1996).

Once more, an emphasis on lifelong learning was justified by reference to global competitive pressures and the changes being wrought by science and the new technologies. However, the OECD went somewhat further in its interests than either UNESCO or the EU. Taking lifelong learning to mean ‘the continuation of conscious learning throughout the lifespan’, the OECD emphasized that this must embrace learning undertaken ‘informally at work, by talking to others, by watching television and playing games, and through virtually every other form of human activity’ (OECD, 1996: 89). Unlike UNESCO, then, the OECD appears to have developed its proposals for lifelong learning in response to what it perceives as the new policy challenges arising from globalization and technological change, as well as evidence of a growing gap between the ‘information rich’ and the ‘information poor’. It resembles UNESCO in that it offers little evidence for the conventional view of a left-to-right trajectory – not least because its ideas never were particularly radical in terms of the established political divide (Field, 2001).

The truth is that OECD has a somewhat different approach, as far as education in general is concerned, from UNESCO. These different approaches are explored in a later part of the study. With regard to its influence, the OECD stands somewhere between the EU's policy institutions and UNESCO's role as debating chamber.

1.5.3. Shared policy proposals

Unwittingly or not, there are certain policies and activities that have been shared by both internal and external institutions. One example is OECD's proposal in the 1970s for paid educational leave (PEL). PEL was deliberately designed to promote what the OECD called 'alternance' across the lifespan between phases of (paid) work, leisure and learning (Field, 2001). PEL, it was argued, would promote a learning culture for all, helping to promote both increased competitiveness and greater social equality (OECD, 1973). Legislation on PEL was subsequently introduced in several European countries and nowadays the European Commission included PEL in the Memorandum for lifelong learning and numerous member states have already modified their legislation in order to include PEL.

Other shared policies include:

- ***Mobility***
- *Innovation*
- *Motivation*
- *Skills*
- *Second-chance schools*

In the 1995 White Paper on “Teaching and Training” as well as in the 1997 Communication *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* the European Commission stresses the need for mobility – a key proposal that has been emphasised by both OECD and UNESCO since the 1970s.

Much the same has happened with the idea of innovation. Innovation today is considered a cornerstone of EU education policy. Along with innovation stands the idea of both ‘motivation’ and ‘skills’. Motivation and skills according to both organizations are the keys to promoting genuine lifelong learning, and the EU appears to concur. Specifically in relation to skills, the EU shares a similar view to that of UNESCO: “a strong foundation in basic skills needs to be laid for everyone equally if large segments of a given population are not to be denied access to further learning, thereby exacerbating problems of social exclusion” (European Commission, 1995; Delors, 1996).

Moreover both the OECD and UNESCO, among others, have proposed the creation of second-chance schools, and the EU White Paper of 1995 made them a priority for action. The Commission is currently looking into the possibility of developing a policy framework with a view to giving coordinated support to a range of initiatives at four separate levels (European Commission, 1999):

- Promoting the development of human resources as a business strategy;
- Improving access to the financial markets and more generally to sources of finance, by improving information on the firm’s “richness” in terms of intangible capital; and its investment in human resources;

- Strengthening employment and growth by developing human resources;
- Encouragement should be given to developing mechanisms for co-financing lifelong training in accordance with the various interests, and building in the principle of shared responsibility.

All the above mentioned proposals are characteristic proposals of OECD that have found parallels more recently in EU policies. The EU also shares the view of the OECD and UNESCO that public funding should increasingly provide only a part of educational investment, with the role of private funds from different sources growing so as to maximize learning access and quality.

Moreover, the European Commission co-operates very closely with both organizations in specific fields like the joint EC/ UNESCO PEDDRO project, which is the networking of information in the field of drug abuse prevention through education. In addition to this, UNESCO's action towards promoting academic mobility, through creating mechanisms for the recognition of studies, academic qualifications and degrees, has gained a new thrust and dimension in the context of the Council of Europe.

1.6. Mobility at a glance: The SOCRATES programme

As has already been mentioned, 'mobility' is used as a case study in the current research to examine the internal and the external factors influencing EU's educational policy. According to the Treaty on the European Community, Community action should encourage mobility in the areas of education, training and research. The

abolition of obstacles to the free movement of people is one of the basic objectives of a united Europe, included since the Treaty of Rome. Indeed, the freedom to come and go is one of the fundamental conditions for the existence of a true “citizens’ Europe”. Without it, it is not possible to speak of a European social area. Equally, mobility is one of the responses to current economic change – caused by the establishment of the single market and the globalization of trade – and its social consequences, notably in relation to employment creation. Personal mobility is a vital element of the European Community’s investment in human resources, which is seen as one of the keys to successfully meeting the economic, social and cultural challenges of the 21st century. This mobility is encouraged by the Commission through a variety of programmes for the trans-national mobility of persons who are keen to undergo training, broaden their horizons to contribute to training activities in another Member State of the Community (European Commission, 1996c).

Trans-national mobility also looks to foster improvement of the understanding of other European societies and cultures; it also enhances the social skills of individuals, who learn how to communicate and live within those societies and to respect diversity; furthermore, it encourages the acquisition of linguistic skills and contributes to the development of “European citizenship” complementing existing citizenship, of the country of origin (European Commission, 1996c). Trans-national mobility also encourages co-operation between education and research institutions and the world of work, thereby helping to improve the quality of education, training and research. It affords greater scope for education, training and research, and opens the door to the transfer of professional skills and knowledge, particularly in innovative areas such as new technologies, new management methods and organization of work. A heightened

sense of creativity, initiative and entrepreneurial spirit is thus engendered. Trans-national mobility offers a brighter future for all those who avail themselves of the opportunity, helping them to adapt to the changing needs of the labour market within the Community. Finally, in economic terms, mobility is an essential aspect of competitiveness in that it encourages the sharing of the most significant innovative experiences as regards technology, organization and production (European Commission, 1996d).

Based on the above mentioned ideas the SOCRATES programme was first launched in 1995. The legal basis of the SOCRATES Decision is to be found in Articles 149 and 150 (ex 126 and 127 respectively) of the Treaty on European Union. Article 149 provides that the Community “shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States” through a range of actions, such as promoting mobility, exchanges of information or the teaching of the languages of the EU. SOCRATES subsumed the Erasmus programme (adopted in 1987) and a major portion of the Lingua programme (adopted in 1989), as well as various pilot initiatives previously undertaken by the Commission, particularly in school education. The SOCRATES programme is based on an integrated framework of actions and activities relating to all levels of education (Report of European Commission, 2000). It is implemented by the Commission and assisted by the SOCRATES Committee, which includes two representatives from each Member State, and is chaired by the Commission. Between 1995 and 1997 the SOCRATES programme was implemented in the 15 Member States of the European Union and in those countries covered by the agreement on the European Economic Area (Iceland,

Liechtenstein and Norway). Since 1997 and 1998, it has also been open to nationals and institutions of a number of countries which have applied to join the EU.

The Phase I of the Programme lasted from 1 January 1995 to 31 December 1999. Its main objective was to contribute to the development of quality education and training and to an open European area for education. It was aimed at a) increasing mobility for students in higher education and b) promoting broad and intensive co-operation between institutions at all levels of education in every Member State, and realizing their intellectual potential through the mobility of teaching staff and c) supporting the intellectual mobility of know-how and experience, in particular through the development of open and distance education and learning at all levels of education.

The Decision No 253/2000/EC of 24 January 2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council established the second phase of the Community programme in the field of education "SOCRATES". The implementation period is between 1 January 2000 and 31 December 2006. The main objectives of SOCRATES Phase II sententiously are:

- To strengthen the European dimension in education at all levels;
- To improve knowledge of foreign languages;
- To promote cooperation and mobility in the field of education;
- To encourage the use of new technologies in education;
- To promote equal opportunities in all sectors of education.

More specifically SOCRATES II (Official Journal of the European Communities, 2000) is aimed:

- a) Strengthening the European dimension in education at all levels and to facilitate wide trans-national access to educational resources in Europe while promoting equal opportunities throughout all fields of education;
- b) Promoting a quantitative and qualitative improvement of the knowledge of the languages of the European Union, in particular those languages which are less widely used and less widely taught, so as to lead to greater understanding and solidarity between the peoples of the European Union and promote the intercultural dimension of education;
- c) Promoting cooperation and mobility in the field of education, in particular by:
 - encouraging exchanges between educational institutions;
 - promoting open and distance learning;
 - encouraging improvements in the recognition of diplomas and periods of study;
 - developing the exchange of information;
 - and to help remove the obstacles in this regard.
- d) Encouraging innovation in the development of educational practices and materials including, where appropriate, the use of new technologies, and to explore matters of common policy interest in the field of education.

SOCRATES II is aimed in particular at (Official Journal of the European Communities, 2000):

- a) pupils, students or other learners;
- b) staff directly involved in education;

- c) all types of educational institutions specified by each Member State;
- d) the persons and bodies responsible for education systems and policies at local, regional and national level within the Member States.

Public or private bodies cooperating with educational institutions may also take part in appropriate actions under this programme, in particular (Official Journal of the European Communities, 2000):

- local and regional bodies and organizations,
- associations working in the field of education, including students', pupils', teachers', and parents' associations,
- companies and consortia, trade organizations and Chambers of Commerce and Industry,
- social partners and their organizations at all levels,
- research centres and bodies.

One of the main actions under the SOCRATES programme is the Erasmus programme. Erasmus was the first major European programme in the area of higher education. Erasmus 'organized' the mobility of students through the institutionalization of inter-University programmes. It was followed by a proliferation of new Community programmes (nine in all) cutting across the vocational training/education/youth policy divides. In formal terms, the origins of the Erasmus Decision can be found in the 1976 action programme and a later set of conclusions reached by the Council and Ministers of Education in 1985 when they welcomed the Commission's intention to submit a proposal on interuniversity co-operation. The Commission used Article 128 as the legal basis for the decision. This was changed by

the Council which added Article 235 EEC as an additional legal basis, reasoning that some of the activities proposed under the programme went beyond the powers conferred upon the Council under the Article 128 and that the subject matter – which included non-vocational subjects and cooperation in relation to research – likewise exceeded the scope of vocational training (O'Mahony, 2003).

Since it was launched in 1987 it has gone from strength to strength and 700.000 students have been able to take advantage of the mobility arrangements under it. Today, nearly all European universities are involved (European Commission, 2000). Erasmus seeks to enhance the quality and reinforce the European dimension of higher education, to encourage transnational cooperation between universities, to boost European mobility in the higher education sector and to improve transparency and academic recognition of studies and qualifications throughout the Community (Official Journal of the European Communities, 2000). SOCRATES/Erasmus is the main programme concerning mobility and supports a wide range of activities:

- **Student and teacher mobility**
- Intensive Programmes
- Joint development and implementation of curriculum
- ECTS⁴ (European Credit Transfer System)
- Thematic Networks and
- Preparatory visits.

⁴ SOCRATES/Erasmus also supports the introduction of the European Credit Transfer System, a system of academic credit allocation and transfer which has been developed experimentally by 145 universities in EU Member States and EFTA countries and is now being implemented by more than 1.000 institutions. This system facilitates the recognition of periods of study abroad (but not of the final degrees) for Erasmus students. It is now widely adopted across Europe also as a basis for a credit system for every student.

Student and teacher mobility

-Students

Students in Higher education may spend a study period (from 3 to 12 months) in another participating country in the framework of agreed arrangements between universities. They generally receive a grant to help offset the ‘mobility costs’ of studying in another country, such as travel, language preparation and differences in the cost of living. Their award depends on several elements which vary from country to country. Full academic recognition for the study period carried out abroad must be ensured before departure, generally by the means of an ECTS Learning Agreement. The programme is open to all higher education students (up to and including doctorate) from a participating country, except for students enrolled in their first year of Higher education.

The European Commission also supports Intensive Language Preparation Courses to enable Erasmus students to function socially and academically in a host country whose language is not widely spoken or taught abroad. They were started as a pilot project in 1996 and are now offered on a regular basis. It is also important that special provisions are available for students with disabilities. According to several studies⁵, the Erasmus experience has made a useful impact not only in terms of academic and social aspects, but also on the future professional life of students.

-Teachers

⁵ PISA studies, OECD, 2000 – ILO study, 1998 e.t.c.

Financial support is given to higher education teaching staff to spend a short period (one week minimum) involved in teaching in a partner University. This experience has an evident impact not only on the teacher directly involved, but also on students from both home and host University. It could also result in a first step towards further European cooperation between the institutions involved.

As we have seen, support for mobility is one of the pillars of the SOCRATES programme. The Commission nonetheless regrets that the Decision establishing the programme has included mobility amongst the objectives, as mobility should evidently have been envisaged not as an end in itself but as a means primarily intended to develop European citizenship. Given the many obstacles which still remain to mobility within the European area, this theme, on which the popularity of Erasmus at the end of the 1980s is based, remains highly topical at European level, particularly in the area of education (European Commission, 2000).

In quantitative terms, the results are good. Over half the Erasmus budget was given over to funding mobility grants for students wishing to undertake part of their studies in another participating country. Some 460.000 students thus benefited from this type of mobility between 1995 and 1999. The average length of student mobility is just under seven months. In addition, over 40.000 university teachers in Europe had the opportunity of academic mobility under inter-institutional programmes firstly, and then under inter-institutional contracts. The decision establishing the SOCRATES programme makes no provision for pupil mobility, but seeks more generally to “encourage contacts among pupils in the European Union”. Some 150.000 pupils and

language teachers moved around between 1995 and 1999 at the end of their joint language project (European Commission, 2000).

Finally, in terms of quality, the analysis becomes more complex given the great diversity of expectations among the education players and decision makers in relation to mobility which cannot be considered an objective in its own right. The impact of mobility is, moreover, very much dependant on problems concerning the recognition of diplomas and periods of study spent elsewhere (European Commission, 2000).

1.7. Summary

What was important in the literature review was the presentation of both the historic development of European education and the factors which seems to have impacted on this development. European education is divided in five time periods, each one of them having different characteristics. The first period, which lasted from 1957 to 1971, is considered as a 'silent' period while the last (so far) period, which is still in progress, is the consolidation period. From the examination of the time periods it became obvious that the momentum has radically altered in European education and many factors have contributed in this alteration.

These factors relate mainly to institutions, both internal and external. The division between internal and external institutions is part of a broader political discussion considering institutionalization and globalization. The literature review revealed some aspects of these political trends and it became apparent that both are concerned with European integration generally with education only one of their interests. But in terms

of education, each of these theoretical approaches has two main representatives. Institutionalization manifests itself in the European Commission and the European Court of Justice while globalization has the OECD and UNESCO. The literature review revealed some of their activities in the field of education. The European Commission seemed to be very active even from the beginning of educational development and the ECJ offered significant assistance. On the other hand, the OECD and UNESCO have a rather less significant contribution in educational development of the EU.

From the literature review a number of questions have arisen and they will be answered through the main part of the research. These questions in particular are:

- Whether both internal and external institutions have impacted on the development of the European educational policy or not.
- Do all institutions had the same participation in the development of educational policy, or perhaps some of them were more proactive?
- To what extent is it true the perception of institutionalists that only European institutions (apart from member states) have influenced this development.
- And if that is true what is the case with international organizations and their influence?
- Is it possible to neglect or even ignore such organizations?

The research will try to shed light in these questions and its result will be presented in chapter 4, namely the analysis chapter.

Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1 Rationale for research design

As a basic tool of the research, mobility was used as a case study. The case study approach has been described as ‘an umbrella term for a family of research methods having in common the decision to focus on inquiry around an instance’ (Adelman et al. 1997, cited in Bell, 1999: 55). It is much more than a story about or a description of an event or state. As in all research, evidence is collected systematically, the relationship between variables is studied and the study is methodically planned. Case studies are concerned principally with the interaction of factors and events and, as Nisbet and Watt (1980) point out, ‘sometimes it is only by taking a practical instance that we can obtain a full picture of this interaction’ (cited in Bell, 1999). A case study is a specific instance that is frequently designed to illustrate a more general principle (Nisbet and Watt, 1984).

The strength of the case study method is that it allows the researcher to concentrate on a specific instance or situation and to identify, or attempt to identify, the various interactive processes at work. These processes may remain hidden in a large-scale survey but may be crucial to the success or failure of systems or organizations (Bell, 1999). Case studies can establish cause and effect, indeed one of their strengths is that they observe effects in real contexts, recognizing that context is a powerful determinant of both causes and effects (Cohen et al., 2001). As Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) suggest the case study approach is particularly valuable when the researcher

has little control over events (cited in Cohen et al., 2001). They consider that a case study has several hallmarks:

- It blends a description of events with the analysis of them
- It focuses on individual actors or groups of actors, and seeks to understand their perception of events
- It highlights specific events that are relevant to the case and
- The researcher is integrally involved in the case.

2.2 Research design

Why was mobility policy chosen as a case study? There were two basic reasons for this choice. First of all, mobility policy, going back to the early 1970s, was the first shared policy between the institutions investigated in this study. As such it allowed for some comparison and cross referencing. The second reason was the fact that, in the early years, mobility policy was in reality the *only* European education policy.

In relation to this case study, a key method of gathering data was via the semi-structured interview. Advantages of this method include the fact that a high degree of flexibility is allowed for further interrogation, and also that the interviewer is able to answer questions concerning both the purpose of the interview and any misunderstandings experienced by the interviewee (Cohen, 2001). This was preferred to other methods, for example, the self-administered questionnaire. While there are advantages to the use of questionnaires – they tend to be reliable, anonymous and more economical than the interview in terms of time and money, they do have their

disadvantages, including many times a low percentage of returns and difficulties in assessing the veracity of the answers (Cohen et al, 2001).

All the interviews carried out for this study⁶ were based on four basic questions which provided enough flexibility for follow-up questions. These questions were:

- What is your role in the European Union today?
- What is your involvement in the development of the mobility policy?
- Which are the factors that have contributed to the development of the European educational policy in general and of the mobility policy specifically?
- Do the international organizations, such as the OECD and UNESCO, have any impact in the development of European educational policy in general and of the mobility policy particularly?

2.3 Research Subjects

Who was to be interviewed for the research? One acknowledged limitation of this study is the time and geographical constraints faced by the researcher. There were some time-consuming procedures like the arrangement of the necessary interviews. Those arrangements were challenging, due to the fact that the interviewees were working in another country, with constrained timetables themselves. It also proved difficult for the researcher to both find the time and finances to support frequent travel to another country, for example Belgium.

⁶ In the Appendix one could find a complete interview transcript.

However, it was felt that face-to-face interviews were an essential component of the research design, given the reasons above and the lack of any existing data on the subject of this research. This, combined with the above constraints, was one of the key reasons why it was decided to interview staff in one institution only – the European Commission. The practical constraints in relation to all four institutions were insurmountable, given the limitations placed on the study. There were, however, other reasons why the Commission was chosen, as opposed to say the OECD. The Commission is at the forefront for educational development throughout Europe being one of the main stakeholders involved, while at the same time it is the only institution that has established relationships with external institutions like OECD and UNESCO.

Given this constraint on the methodology, it was important to identify key individuals to be interviewed. In total, seven people were interviewed for the research, all having worked or are still working for the Commission's Directorate General for Education and Culture (as now known). More specifically:

- Two of the interviewees, as well as working for the Commission, had also worked for the OECD, providing a useful level of insight;
- Two others were or still are senior management in the Lifelong Learning Unit, and as such proved highly knowledgeable of numerous education policies;
- One of the interviewees is now responsible for communication and co-operation between the European Commission and external organizations such as the OECD and UNESCO.

While of course the fact that, as EU civil servants, their main allegiance may be to the EU, and as such their objectivity may be questionable, it is hoped that the quality of those interviewed (in respect to their lengthy involvement with European education), may act somewhat as a counterbalance to any perceived subjectivity.

Chapter 3: Findings

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the development of education policy in the EU, and the kinds of factors, both internal and external, that could be said to have influenced this development. In order to explore these factors this chapter is structured based on the time periods outlined in the literature review. Within this framework, the interviews are used to explore the influence of both European and global institutions on the development of EU educational policy, and mobility policy was used as a case study to achieve this outcome. The results suggest EU educational policy is a rather complicated field and certainly one of the more interesting in the EU context, especially during the last decade. As stated above, the historical division of European education into time periods will be helpful in the presentation of the results as well as the analysis. As a Commission official in DG EAC states:

“I think that there are two stages: One started in 1971 and lasted until 1999. And it was mobility; it always started in Higher education and then spread over into other levels of education [...] the new agenda is much more policy and reform oriented and it started with the Bologna process, again in Higher education” (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004).

This division is helpful in that it establishes a general explanatory structure for the current research. The two periods have different characteristics and the first period

which is the larger one can also be divided into three sub periods. The first sub period lasted from 1971 to 1983, the second one lasted from 1983 to 1992 and the third one lasted from 1992 to 1999. But before examining each period separately, a first look at mobility policy is necessary.

3.2. The mobility issue

Mobility is used as a case study to ascertain the degree of influence exerted by EU and international institutions. It should be clarified that ‘mobility’, during the formative stage of education policy, stood for education generally - in the early days of the EU mobility was the only policy proposed and supported by European institutions. According to a European Commission DG EAC official interviewed for this study:

“The first generation of policies (in the European Community) is related to higher education, is mobility and it was intra-EC. The first agenda was only mobility and by this I mean mobility without any changes in structures” (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004).

Each new aspect of educational policy proposed by the EU is normally tested in higher education and only if it is successful there is it expanded. In the early years when the European Community proposed the mobility policy, it was implemented only in higher education. Moreover, because the European Community did not at that stage have either the authority or the power to impose its policies, it could not suggest

changes in the member states' structures to make it easier for them to implement mobility policy.

According to the Commission:

‘When they started, Community programmes in education, training and youth placed a strong emphasis on learning abroad – ‘mobility’. They steadily expanded to cover other sorts of action, notably transnational co-operation and exchange projects (intercultural learning, curriculum development, training and training products, thematic networks, information strategies, etc.) and systems to improve the quality of formal, informal and non-formal learning, of mobility and recognition (ECTS, NARIC) (European Commission, 2002a).

It is time now to present the main findings of this research divided in four periods. Each of these periods will have a sub section concerning the influence, if there is any, of both internal and external institutions.

3.2.1. ‘1971-1983’

Initially, the focus will be on the first sub period which lasted from 1971 to 1983.

According to a DG EAC official:

“The most important action in European educational policy, ERASMUS, didn’t come from the heavens. There was great preparation. This preparation started in the mid-1970s when the European Parliament published the Antonino report, which referred to the Europe of Citizens” (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004).

Moreover according to another DG EAC official:

“It (ERASMUS) started because citizens’ education would be an area where the European Community could provide added value”
(Interview, DG EAC official 1, 24 March 2004).

In 1971, the six Ministers of Education met for the first time. One year later the Paris Summit took place where education was included for the first time within the remit of one of the then thirteen commissioners. The Commission established these working groups, in order to reflect on a possible future co-operation in the field of education. The results of their work were presented in the so-called “Janne report”. The Janne report could be considered as the first cohesive publication referring to European education. It identified a number of areas for development that have concerned, and continue to concern, policy makers and educators across the EU. Of course, the Janne report made it clear that education is and should remain a national, rather than European, competence. Nevertheless, the Report announced the start of European co-operation in education. Following that, the Antonino report was published in 1975, which is also a significant document, but the most important action of that period was

the 1976 Resolution on Co-operation in Education⁷ announcing an ‘action programme’ which included studies, research, visits, and compilations of up-to-date documentation and statistics in a number of educational fields. The broad lines of EC interest in education in this period, and indeed for the next thirty years, can be summarized by the six fields of action identified in the Action Programme:

- Developing the educational dimension of social policy generally by seeking better facilities for the education and training of nationals and the children of nationals of Member States of the Communities and of non-member countries;
- The promotion of closer relations between educational systems in Europe;
- The compilation of up-to-date documentation and statistics on education;
- Increased co-operation specifically in the field of higher education, and especially increased possibilities for the mutual recognition of diplomas and academic qualifications;
- The achievement of equality of opportunity in relation to free access to all forms of education (Council OJ No C 38 1976; Shaw, 1999, 561).

The Action Programme could be seen as a declaration of intent expressing the political will of both the Ministers of Education and the Council as a whole but not in any way binding (O’Mahony, 2003). As the EC’s Lifelong learning (LLL) Head of Unit says:

“The Resolution was the basis of the evolution but was still only words.

Without a legal basis you can’t do anything. Without money to start a

⁷ Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council comprising an action programme in the field of education (O.J. No C 38, 19.02.1976, p.1).

pilot project you can't do anything" (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004).

Factors impacting development

At this stage both the Commission and the Court of Justice started being more proactive and threw their weight behind a more extensive interpretation of the term 'vocational' as a means of spurring action in the education area. The Commission did this by basing its proposals for various types of educational programmes on Article 235 and/or Article 128. The former allowed the Council to take the appropriate legislative measures to attain an EC objective, even if the treaty has not provided the necessary powers (O'Mahony, 2003). In the Commission, education and training as a policy-making area obtained more institutional status in this first sub period and more specifically in the early 1980s. In 1982, education was moved from Directorate-General (DG) XII (Science, Research and Development) to DG V, which became the DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Education. This move also marked an increased emphasis on a more functional approach to European education instead of viewing education in the context of its academic qualities (O'Mahony, 2003). For its part, the Court ruled in favour of the use of these provisions in a number of landmark decisions such as the 1974 Casagrande case, thus elevating education to one of the EC's informal objectives while at the same time sanctioning a broad interpretation of Article 128 (Sprokkereef, 1992). The Casagrande case had its legal starting point in Article 49 EEC in which the Community has the power to adopt 'measures required to bring about, by progressive stages, freedom of movement for workers'. The resulting judgement in Casagrande case was:

‘Although educational and training policy is not as such intended in the spheres which the treaty has entrusted to the Community institutions, it does not follow that the exercise of powers transferred to the Community is in some ways limited if it is of such a nature as to effect the measures taken in the execution of a policy such as that of education and training’ [par. 12, 779] (cited in Murphy, 2003:556).

What started out as a case involving the free movement of workers ended up with a judgement that allowed for the partial extension into the arena of education, an arena that supposedly existed within the exclusive competence of member states. Also, a very notable characteristic of this sub period, from an institutional angle, is the establishment in 1975 of CEDEFOP the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training and the creation in 1980 of the EURYDICE network to promote the exchange of information on national educational systems and policies in member states, as well as on Community-level action in the field of education (Whitehead, 2000). The CEDEFOP was a manifestation that something had started to change in relation to education. The CEDEFOP, since its establishment, has been proactive and provides an important network for the exchange of ideas and information.

The influence of external institutions during this period is different. The Faure report (UNESCO) of 1972 and the Recurrent Education report (OECD) of 1973 are considered to be of great importance as they are two documents that strongly proposed the adoption of lifelong learning and the promotion of mobility as a means

to achieve that goal. Even though there is no documentation proving the relation of these organizations with European educational policy in the early years, some of the officials interviewed for the research admitted that:

“...maybe there was in the heads of those who in that stage had ideas for an agenda in education for the EU. Probably they read and were aware of these reports and all that...” (Interview, DG EAC official 2, 25 March 2004).

“...we have to ask whether we were directly inspired by these organizations or whether we have picked up messages that come to our stage [...] I think we haven’t really drawn inspiration but we have picked up the messages emerging about the importance of education and about the knowledge based society” (Interview, Commission expert, 22 April 2004).

The Commission’s relationship with the OECD, as a DG EAC official admits:

‘Has grown and improved greatly over the last few years but is very recent. Historically, it was problematic. What you have is a gradual convergence’ (Interview, DG EAC official 1, 24 March 2004). *‘OECD always had a pretty honorable record of dealing with education issues in terms of the efficiency of systems, and never attempted to subordinate education systems to a narrow economic interests but what it did say is that education is important to the economic competence of countries’*

(Interview, DG EAC official 1, 24 March 2004). The fact remains that 'there was no communication between us and the OECD until about 1997 or 1998' (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004).

As another DG EAC official says:

'You are not going to find much documentation about our relationship with OECD' (Interview, DG EAC official 1, 24 March 2004).

The story of UNESCO is rather different. As the Commission's LLL Head of Unit says:

"The early years UNESCO and the Council of Europe had a very important role, because then the EC had only 10 member states. So it was very crucial the countries that were not members and they did not have any accession agreement in that stage to have a voice and somebody to claim their rights. Of course when the Community started to spread the role of these organizations started to shrink" (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004).

This statement tends to suggest that, in the first period UNESCO, apart from an inspiring role, had a more concrete responsibility. That was the case in that first sub period relative to the impact of institutions.

3.2.2. '1983-1992'

These early foundations provided the bases for subsequent further development and expansion, most notably in the second sub period 1983-1992. During the 1980s, there was a growing realization that a successful European Community could not be based exclusively on the promotion of ideas and actions concerning economic and political integration outside the realms of education. A DG EAC official says on that issue:

“In the EC we had to justify our activities in education and training always with economic motives; because that was the reason for our existence; whereas since the Treaty of Maastricht education is an article so it is a value in itself. And we can now stress, as we do in every occasion that we had to do all activities in education for us, for all the individuals. It is for your personal development and employment, it is for citizenship, it is for multicultural knowledge and it is also economic. It is both”. (Interview, DG EAC official 2, 25 March 2004).

The Stuttgart and Fontainebleau Declarations of 1983 and 1984 did much to foster the notion of European citizenship and these were reinforced by the 1985 Resolution on a “People’s Europe”. The Resolution of the Council of Ministers on the European “Dimension in education”, of 24 May 1988, was a significant document. Together with the 1991 Memorandum on higher education in the European Community, it helped map the way for further, rapid developments in Community programmes in the field of education, training and youth. By the end of the period 1983-1992, such

programmes were numerous: COMETT, EUROTECNET, FORCE, LINGUA, TEMPUS, PETRA, YOUTH FOR EUROPE and of course the most important one – ERASMUS (Whitehead, 2000).

According to a DG EAC official, since ERASMUS began:

“It has a double function of European citizenship and the labour market. In the early days the labour market was very much the motive” (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004).

Factors impacting development

In formal terms, the origins of the ERASMUS Decision can be found over ten years earlier in the 1976 action programme and a later set of conclusions reached by the Council and Ministers of Education in 1985 when they welcomed the Commission’s intention to submit a proposal on interuniversity co-operation. The Commission used Article 128 as the legal basis for the decision. This was changed by the Council which added Article 235 EEC as an additional legal basis, reasoning that some of the activities proposed under the programme went beyond the powers conferred upon the Council under Article 128 and that the subject matter – which included non-vocational subjects and co-operation in relation to research – likewise exceeded the scope of vocational training. The dispute went to the Court of Justice and the Court largely found in favour of the Commission⁸ (O’Mahony, 2003).

⁸ The Court concluded that only the research aspects of the Decision necessitated the addition of Article 235, for the rest it gave a wide interpretation of the scope of Article 128 EEC.

The catalyst for EC/EU action with regard to the recognition of educational qualifications and for the establishment of the ERASMUS programme came from developments within the legal field of free movement of labour. The most influential judgement of the Court was in the Gravier case. According to DG EAC official:

“There was a ruling by the ECJ and everything EU has done later on lies in this ruling, in this decision of the ECJ. It was the Gravier case. Because the ECJ with Gravier case said “Higher education” is in essence professional education because it is a condition to access to professional activity. There was a new door opened” (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004).

More specifically the Gravier case found that:

Any form of vocational training prepares for a qualification for a particular profession, trade or employment or which provides the necessary training and skills for such a profession, trade or employment is vocational training, whatever the age and the level of training of the pupils or students, and even if the training programme includes an element of general education (Case 293/83, cited in Murphy 2003: 556).

The Commission acted on the basis of the ECJ's rulings and ECJ has decided on numerous occasions in favour of the Commission even if the Humbel case somehow constrained the Commission's activity. The ruling in the Gravier case opened a

window of opportunity the Commission was able to exploit when faced with a lack of treaty basis in order to propose other programmes such as LINGUA and SOCRATES. However, this ‘window of opportunity’ for the Commission was carefully circumscribed by the Court as it made clear that while Article 128 could be applied to include much higher education it clearly did not include compulsory schooling or general adult education and pre-school education (O’Mahony, 2003). This decision was made even more clear in the Humbel case⁹, where the Court indicated that the definition of vocational education may not cover general schooling. In any case the ECJ produced, via both in the Gravier case and also in Blaizot (1988), in which the Advocate General advised ‘in general, university studies fulfill (vocational training) criteria’ – a very wide-ranging interpretation of Article 128 (Murphy, 2003: 556).

Of significance was the Commission’s capability of taking advantage of ECJ’s rulings. It manipulated the crucial ECJ’s rulings, the most significant of which were the cases of “*Casagrande*”, “*Gravier*” and “*Blaizot*”¹⁰, and it moved forward the educational discussion, in particular the mobility issue. What is important is the way in which the ECJ has interpreted existing legislation in particular case law. Alongside a series of constitutional reforms begun in 1976, the case law of the ECJ has ‘deeply affected the scheme’ established in the Treaty of Rome (Mancini, 1998). The most decisive component was the way in which the ECJ has interpreted Article 128 (EEC) via a number of benchmark European Court cases. These interpretations open the way for the Commission and the European Council.

⁹ Case 263/86 *Belgian State v. Rene-Humbel and Marie-Therese Edel*, [1989] 1 CMLR 393

¹⁰ Case 9/74, *Donato Casagrande v. Landeshauptstadt Munchen*, [1974] ECR 773; Case 293/83, *Gravier v. city of Liege*, [1985] ECR 593; *Blaizot*, [1988] ECR 379

This second sub period was a decisive period in which the European Court of Justice (ECJ) stood by the European Commission and opened new avenues. In the words of the EC's LLL Head of Unit:

“Nothing would have happened without the help of the ECJ. The ECJ was always very important because virtually, with the Gravier case it opened up whole new avenues” (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004).

As Murphy (Murphy, 2003: 553) says:

“the level of ambiguity, both legally and politically, has progressively allowed for the demarcations between policy sectors to become significantly blurred over the decades, and in this regard no actor has played more of a central role (with the possibly exception of the European Commission) than the ECJ. This blurring relates to the changing delegation of competence, and while it is true that the ECJ has ‘legal dominance over all member states’ Courts within its spheres of competence’, what is more significant is the manner in which the ECJ has defined, altered, and in some cases radically transformed the balance of competencies between the national and the European level”.

After the ERASMUS initiation, education received its own Directorate General within the Commission, which suggested a major re-think on how the Commission dealt with education. An independent Task Force for Human Resources, Education, Training

and Youth was created in 1988 within DG V of the Commission and this became a fully-fledged Directorate General in 1993 under the title DG for Education, Training and Youth or DG XXII which is now the Directorate General for Education and Culture, DG EAC.

While during this period, internal institutions such as the Commission and the ECJ were playing a major role, the impact of external institutions was much more muted. As the Head of LLL said, ‘with the expansion of the European Community there was not much for UNESCO to do in the European area’ (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004). That is possibly the reason why UNESCO dealt almost exclusively with non-European issues during this time. By the end of the 1980s, UNESCO returned to the European field but now its role was more restrained. In 1992 UNESCO’s Lisbon convention took place, which was a UNESCO and Council of Europe joint instrument. UNESCO and the Council of Europe worked together in the European region, because UNESCO had a systematic approach to working with regional organizations. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that both the OECD and UNESCO did not play significant roles regarding EU education during this period.

3.2.3. ‘1992 - 1999’

The third sub period began in 1992 with the Treaty on European Union, which marked a turning point in educational policy at the European level, recognizing education for the first time as an official area of Community competence and linking

it with culture, again for the first time. Three of the articles of the treaty can be considered as a unity:

- Article 126, referring to education in general;
- Article 127, referring to the implementation of a vocational training policy;
- Article 128, referring to the promotion of culture.

In all three cases, the treaty is careful to emphasize the fact that EU policy in these domains is intended to supplement and support the action of member states, while fully respecting their national responsibilities and national cultural and linguistic diversities. The Treaty on European Union (TEU) provided European institutions with a legal mandate in education for the first time, specifically to the European Commission. In particular Article 126 (now 149) enumerates six specific educational objectives of Community action:

- Developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States;
- Encouraging the mobility of students and teachers, inter alia by encouraging the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study;
- Promoting cooperation between educational establishments;
- Developing exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the education systems of the Member States;
- Encouraging the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors;
- Encouraging the development of distance education.

The six objectives of Community action echo the objectives contained in the Action Programme of Education first agreed in 1976. The Article 127 (now 150) follows the same organizational structure as Article 126. In the first paragraph, the Community is empowered to ‘implement a vocational training policy’, which is different from the ‘incentive measures’ mentioned under Article 126. Nevertheless, even if the word ‘policy’ is used in Article 127, the limitations imposed constitutionally are similar to the ones elaborated under Article 126, in that the vocational training policy ‘shall support and supplement the action of the Member States, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organization of vocational training’ (O’Mahony, 2003: 98). However, while these Articles did not have the power to change the structures and contents of member states’ educational policies, they did provide fresh impetus for the Commission to develop more concrete initiatives. This legal basis, in addition with the previous rulings of the ECJ, created the conditions for further institutionalization of education and gave the Commission the opportunity to unfold its ideas and policies in numerous Communications, which were mainly White and Green Papers.

Factors impacting development

The first manifestation of the consolidation of the educational ideas set out in the 1992 treaty was revealed in the 1993 Green Paper of the Commission, on the ‘European Dimension in Education’. This gave member states an opportunity to consider the direction of future educational policy at the EU level and to reflect on the ways in which such policy might interact with existing and future educational policies at the national level. The discussions stimulated by the 1992 “Treaty” and by the 1993

Green Paper helped the further development and reconfiguration and expansion of a number of existing programmes:

- LEONARDO da VINCI;
- SOCRATES I (which subsumed existing ERASMUS and LINGUA programmes);
- YOUTH FOR EUROPE and
- TEMPUS.

The discussions also engendered a number of new educational documents and actions from the Commission, the most important of which were:

- The 1993 White Paper *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment* – the “Jacques Delors White Paper” which was the first publication stressing the need to develop education and training to encourage growth and prosperity.
- The 1995 White Paper *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society*. This key EU educational document of the 1990s was followed up by an Implementation document. Included in the White Paper were a number of guidelines for action and they were grouped under five specific objectives. These guidelines were not binding for the member states but their effect was significant. A number of member states changed their national structures in order to implement some of the proposed policies and the convergence started to become a reality.
- 1996 was designated the ‘European Year of Lifelong Learning’. For the first time, it was obvious that lifelong learning was at the frontline of European

policy. During this year, major programmes and activities took place for the promotion of this idea and according to the officials interviewed for the research the response from member states was impressive. These two initiatives, more than anything else, provoked a European debate around the future of European education.

- The December 1996 report of the EU study group on education and training *Accomplishing Europe through education and training* (European Commission, 1996c).
- The 1996 Green Paper *Education-Training-Research; the obstacles to transnational mobility*, which refers to the advantages of mobility in terms of education, training and research and indicates again the importance of mobility in European education (European Commission, 1996d).
- The 1997 White Paper *Towards a Europe of Knowledge*. In this White Paper three dimensions of European educational area are emphasised: knowledge, citizenship and competence. Moreover, in this White Paper one could find the basic guidelines for EU actions in education, training and youth for the period 2000-2006 (European Commission, 1997).

On the other hand, a kind of revival (concerning their impact on European education) was witnessed with both the OECD and UNESCO during this period. In 1996 OECD published the 'Education at a glance: OECD indicators' (OECD, 1996), which contained statistical analyses on a wide range of educational areas, but particularly student mobility. In the same year, UNESCO, under the chairmanship of Delors, published the 'Learning: the treasure within' (Delors, 1996), referring mainly to the necessity of lifelong learning and of mobility as a means of promoting it.

3.2.4 '1999 – '

In the current period, European education has entered a different stage. According to a Commission Expert DG EAC interviewed for this research:

“What is really new is that the promotion of mobility used to be the only important role for the EU in education and now we have moved to a totally different stage where mobility is a very important part but definitely no longer the only part. This whole new policy agenda goes beyond mobility, and mobility is one of the 13 objectives of Lisbon” (Interview, Commission Expert DG EAC, 22 April 2004).

The Bologna Declaration (19 June 1999) was signed by 28 European countries and includes a series of common goals for the development of higher education. It sets as the overall objective the creation of a 'European space for higher education' to be completed in 2010. More specific goals defined in the declaration include:

- The adoption of a common framework of transparent and comparable degrees;
- The introduction of undergraduate and postgraduate levels in all countries, with first degrees no shorter than 3 years and relevant to the labour market;
- A European dimension in quality assurance, with comparable criteria and methods;

- The elimination of remaining obstacles to the free mobility of students (as well as trainees and graduates) and teachers (as well as researchers and higher education administrators) (Hingel, 2001).

Many of these actions are in conformity with Community initiatives carried out within the frame of the SOCRATES programme (Erasmus). In addition to that, as a DG EAC official says:

“The Bologna Declaration is the first document which refers to the external aspects of policy and reforms and is the first one which refers to the external dimensions” (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004).

The Lisbon Agenda, the result of the Lisbon European Council Summit of March 2000, represents the response of the member states and Commission to the challenges posed by the knowledge-driven economy, globalization and the enlargement of the EU, and could possibly have the potential to provide a new impetus to policy making in education. Educational policies are here again at the centre of attention of two central messages by way of: an introduction in the conclusions of specific educational benchmarks and guidelines, and the invitation to Ministers of Education to reflect on Common objectives for educational systems in Europe. The benchmarks and guidelines on education and training are central to the Lisbon conclusions, with the Heads of State identifying clear aims and guidelines for national systems (par. 26). The three most central for education are:

- A substantial annual increase in per capita investment in human resources;
- The number of 18 to 24 year olds with only secondary level education who are not in further education and training should be halved by 2010;
- A European framework should define the new basic skills to be provided through lifelong learning: IT skills, foreign languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills (Hingel, 2001).

However, the conclusions of the Lisbon Council had great impact in European education mainly through the invitation of the Education Council which was made in paragraph 27 of the Conclusions:

‘The European Council asks the Council (Education) to undertake a general reflection on the concrete future objectives of education systems, focusing on common concerns and priorities while respecting national diversity, with a view to contributing to the Luxembourg and Cardiff processes and presenting a broader report to the European Council in the Spring of 2001’ (Lisbon Presidency Conclusions, No. 27).

Policy co-operation in education and training through this process focuses on the following three strategic objectives, which are broken down into 13 associated objectives (one of them being mobility):

- Improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in the EU;
- Facilitating the access of all to education and training systems;

- Opening-up education and training systems to the wider world.

In order to achieve these objectives by 2010, EU actors must draw on policy co-operation using the Open Method of Coordination, ‘in order to enhance the value added of European action’ in accordance with Articles 149 (ex 126) and 150 (ex 127) of the Treaty (European Commission, 2002f).

The Open Method of Coordination was defined by the Lisbon European Council as ‘the means of spreading best practice and achieving greater convergence towards the main EU goals...[it] is designed to help Member States progressively develop their own policies...’. Its purposes in the area of education and training may be defined as a way of enabling mutual comparison and learning, and thereby of limiting the risks inherent in change and reform (European Commission, 2002f).

Factors impacting development

The Bologna Declaration was the first to refer to external aspects of policy and reforms and is the first one which refers to the external dimensions, and as a DG EAC official says:

‘the new agenda, the Lisbon-based agenda, recognizes the impact of globalization, recognizes the impact of the knowledge society but actually started with the Bologna process’ (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004).

At Lisbon, the European Council acknowledged the EU was confronted with ‘a quantum shift resulting from globalization and the knowledge-driven economy’ and agreed a strategic target: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion by 2010. The OMC is the most characteristic example of this new dimension in education, and as the DG LLL Head of Unit admits, ‘globalization is the most influential factor concerning the intensive cooperation in the education field’ (Interview, DG EAC, Head of Lifelong Learning Unit, 22 April 2004). With the evolution of the OMC, it is clear that the Commission, in framing its proposals, takes not only the views of the member state executive but also transnational actors such as the social partners and NGOs into account, suggesting further evidence of the impact of globalization.

The contribution of the Commission to the Lisbon agenda is apparent. What is not clear is the status of international organizations after the Bologna process and the implementation of the OMC as the way for further integration. This method, which is designed to help Member States to progressively develop their own policies, involves:

- Fixing guidelines for the Union combined with specific timetables for achieving the goals which they set in the short, medium and long terms;
- Establishing, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks against the best in the world and tailored to the needs of different Member States and sectors as a means of comparing best practice;

- Translating these European guidelines into national and regional policies by setting specific targets and adopting measures, taking into account national and regional differences;
- Periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review organized as mutual learning processes¹¹.

On the one hand, the OMC defines the common outcomes or objectives in a given policy area. On the other hand, the OMC is an instrument for identifying best policy practices, using the diversity of policy approaches in European countries as a grand reservoir of ideas for possible policy measures to achieve the agreed objectives or outcomes. The full use of indicators and benchmarks is central to the success of the method (European Commission, 2004). The EU early on recognized that OECD has done relevant work in the field of quantifying the performance of education systems. 'I think the deepest influence OECD has had is through the impact of the PISA studies¹², which revealed to countries their weaknesses [...] The OECD basically does benchmarking in its pure sense which is allowing people to judge for themselves where they are relevant to other people' (Interview, Commission Expert, 22 April 2004). This appears to be the basic contribution of the OECD. As a DG EAC official says, 'the indicators used are entirely OECD indicators' (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004). Indeed, in all the European Commission publishing after the Lisbon Council¹³ one can see the impact of OECD's indicators and benchmarks. The impact of the PISA studies was substantial and is also why today the Commission co-

¹¹ Conclusions of Lisbon European Council 23/24 March 2000 – paragraph 37.

¹² PISA: Programme for International Student Assessment, OECD, 2000.

¹³ Like the 2002: European report on quality indicators of Lifelong Learning or the 2004: Progress towards the common objectives in education and training and many more.

operates more with OECD and that is why the DG EAC official states that the provision in Article 149 is anachronistic (see below).

After the Bologna process ‘OECD has probably, in a way, contributed to making the EU agenda more acceptable, because OECD itself has its own agenda in education. They have contributed to making countries wake up to their deficiencies’ (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004). Another DG EAC official says characteristically:

“...it was the member states which were saying you have got to work more closely with the OECD. Historically, the main pressure was to work with the Council of Europe. If you look at the Treaty Article 149 it says cooperate with international organizations and in particular with the Council of Europe [...] but that provision in article 149 quite sincerely looks quite anachronistic. If they were writing that article today they would say ‘in particular with the OECD’” (Interview, DG EAC official 3, 23 April 2004).

This statement perhaps reflects the shift that has occurred in the relationship between the EU and the OECD. Then again, as with the OECD case, the Bologna Declaration gave a new impetus to UIE’s (UNESCO Institute for Education) efforts. But in contrary to OECD and as a DG EAC official says:

“UNESCO produces ideas and indications and that is very important but in most cases their analysis consults with our own analysis so there is no contradiction. But I do not think that UNESCO has really had a

traceable influence on what the EU has been doing, not in Higher education or in education in general. This does not mean that it is neglected. It just means that I do not think that has made a significant difference, because their analysis consults with ours” (Interview, DG EAC official 2, 25 March 2004).

According to a DG EAC official:

“There are one or two areas where we worked (with UNESCO), notably: mutual recognition, which is tied into mobility, also adult learning, adult education and some aspects of vocational training” (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004).

As far as mutual recognition or diploma recognition is concerned, the European Commission has established two networks called NARIC and ENIC. NARIC is the European Commission and ENIC is UNESCO and Council of Europe. But in most cases they are the same body. As a DG EAC official says

“We have been supporting their networking partly because it is serving many interests. And we have also jointly with UNESCO and the Council of Europe, through the NARIC network, developed something called the diploma supplement, which has now become doctrine, written in our Lisbon process. As it has been agreed in government level from 2006 all EU countries will systematically issue the diploma supplement along with university degrees. So the diploma supplement is a standard

template or format which describing the studies which give rise to a particular qualification and it set up a code of practice about how issue should be resolved [...] so that would be one extremely concrete example over our cooperation with UNESCO” (Interview, DG EAC official 2, 25 March 2004).

From the above mentioned it becomes clear that the momentum has changed in European education and the member states apart from the internal institutions have new allies helping them towards convergence.

3.3. Conclusion

With respect to the issue of factors the research generated some interesting results. A significant finding relates to the division of time periods. According to the DG EAC officials, European educational policy is separated into two different periods. The first period, in fact, is divided into three sub periods with specific characteristics for each one. The mobility issue was significant in the early years, and as the research revealed it still is. So when the talk is about European educational policy in that early stage it refers mainly to mobility. This was because the EU had no legitimacy to act on or interfere with, the educational policy of the member states. This is the main difference between the two main periods (1971-1999, 1999-onwards) - in the first period a legal basis did not exist while in the second and mainly after the Lisbon Council and based on the provisions of the Maastricht Treaty, EU obtained the right to interfere with the national education systems and as a result could more easily promote its ideas and policies. What is common in both periods is the dominant place

of the European Commission in the efforts for a single European educational space, while external institutions had rather little impact in the development of mobility policies, at least since the late 1990s. Since then the momentum has changed radically and now member states are striving for co-operation.

In brief, the findings chapter has revealed that both internal and external institutions have impacted on the development of European education but the research suggests that the extent of the influence of each institution diverges. In the early years the European Commission took the lead in the development of education policies but the external institutions also contributed to that development, while during the next period (1982-1999) these institutions had a rather slight contribution in the development of any policy, as far as education was concerned. In that period, the ECJ covered the absence of external influence and became a significant co-player of the Commission. Today, according to the findings, external institutions have found themselves again with a more concrete role in the development of European education and that is mainly due to the Open Method of Coordination. The Lisbon Council, where the OMC was introduced, has also contributed to further institutionalization, providing a leading role to the Commission and several privileges to other European institutions, like the European Council and the European Parliament.

The findings chapter revealed a number of issues regarding the impact of institutions on the development of European education. It has also revealed several areas of cooperation between internal and external institutions. Moreover, the division of time periods made it easier to explore the extent of the impact of institutions in any

different period of EU education policy. The findings chapter has already provided some answers to a number of questions. It becomes clear that external institutions cannot be neglected. Furthermore, it suggests that both internal and external institutions have impacted on the development of European education even if the extent of their impact is questionable. In the following chapter an attempt will be made to discover what the findings offer in relation to the original questions. The analysis that follows will clarify certain aspects of the research and suggest some potential solutions to the initial research questions, and more specifically will answer if, indeed, both internal and external institutions have influenced the development of EU's educational policy and what was the extent of the impact of each organization.

Chapter 4: Analysis

4.1. Introduction

In the findings chapter the results revealed the impact of institutions on the development of European education as well as the extent of this impact. Moreover, an opportunity was provided to understand the general framework of European educational development through the division of time periods and the examination of each one separately. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the significance of the findings for the original questions at the centre of this research study.

In the literature review a number of issues arose, the most important of which was the different approaches taken to the analysis of European educational policy, institutionalization and globalization. Each of these approaches has at least two significant manifestations. While in the literature review an attempt was made to clarify some of these specific characteristics, the findings chapter provided some indication as to their influence on the development of European education policy. Through the interviews, it became possible to investigate the historic development of European education policy and to discover what factors have significantly influenced this development. In this chapter an attempt is made to reveal whether the initial hypothesis – that both internal and external factors have influenced the development of European educational policy – is correct and if that is the case what is the extent of this influence. The issues concerning both institutionalization and globalization will be examined in relation to the development of mobility policy. Additionally, because

mobility is used as a case study for this research an important issue in this chapter will be to generalize, where feasible, the findings in order for them to cover the wider notion of European education policy.

As made clear from the previous chapters the renaissance of European education was interwoven with the mobility aspect. From the early 1990s, this ceased to be the case. The European Union, with the Treaty of Maastricht, acquired a legal basis and a new era started in European education. Mobility, since then, is just one objective and not the aim itself. During this long-lasting procedure, the frame of European education has altered in numerous ways. The present momentum of European cooperation in education is a result of hard work mainly from European institutions, and more specifically the European Commission, the member states and the external forces which exhibit a rather complex participation in the whole procedure. This kind of influence and involvement will be examined in the following sections.

4.2. The development of EU's educational policy

The literature review revealed the decisive role of two European institutions, namely the European Commission and the European Court of Justice (ECJ). These two institutions have cooperated very closely in numerous policy domains, and education is just one example of this cooperation. The interviews with the officials support this view. Each official stated that the European Commission is the champion in European education, but that nothing would have happened if it had not been for the ECJ and its rulings. Of course, the institutionalization of education was not a simple process. Since the Treaty of Rome, European institutions have mainly concerned themselves

with economic development and convergence between the member states. Social integration at that stage was not a priority and that was clear from policy developments. Over the years the perception regarding the necessity of education policy has changed radically, and in the early 1970s Europe witnessed the resurgence of lifelong learning. From then on a new era began in European education, but until the middle 1990s one element was common: the lack of trust in European institutions. It was inconceivable for the European nations to lose their sovereignty in such a crucial social policy domain.

On the other hand, lies globalization, which is a more recent trend as it exists in its current form from the 1980s onwards. It can be said that a new political, economic and cultural era has begun where nation states are no longer the most significant actors and are not the only determinants of economic and political change. In this new environment the nation states still have a decisive role in the formation of their national political and economic agenda, but this role is becoming more constrained, due to the influence of both European and external institutions.

As made clear in the literature review the historic development of educational policy in the EU can be characterized in five stages beginning from 1957 with the Treaty of Rome. These five stages have several different characteristics, moving historically according to Professor Whitehead from indifference to convergence. During the research process this five stage theory was confirmed. Officials interviewed for this research used this approach to develop their argument on the evolution of the EU's educational policy. In order to explore in depth the impact of the institutions the same structure as the previous chapter will be followed.

4.2.1. '1957-1971'

Impact of internal and external institutions:

During this period of silence, the six member states were not concerned with education as a European level public policy. The Treaty of Rome was an economic treaty, and more social concerns were not a priority. Officials admitted that it was impossible to imagine a social convergence at that stage. However, the Treaty of Rome had some indirect references in education, mainly through vocational training and specifically with articles 118 and 128.

Besides the existence of these articles little happened to promote education until the early 1970s. European institutions and member states were uninterested in most social matters, particularly because social policy was deemed a primarily national competence. This was also the case with external institutions. They were only concerned with economic issues even if UNESCO was trying to kick start a debate on education.

Extent of impact on educational policy:

Generally, it could be said, that in this period neither internal nor external institutions impacted greatly on the development of European education because the EU lacked any coherent educational policy during this time.

4.2.2. '1971-1983'

Impact of internal and external institutions:

This period was marked by the extensive efforts of both the European Commission and the European Court of Justice in interpreting the term ‘vocational’ as a means of spurring action in education. The European Commission, even from this early stage, attempted to take advantage of ECJ’s rulings and to take leadership in the promotion of education. The ECJ, with its rulings, fostered education by helping the Commission to undertake new initiatives and to propose new policies. But as education was in a rather primary stage at that time, the margins for greater impact were constrained and this is why both institutions were more proactive in the following periods.

On the other hand, international organizations had already from the early 1970s demonstrated intensive activity as far as the promotion of education was concerned. UNESCO was more proactive in these early years, expanding the Community’s ideas in many countries which were not members and thus they did not have much connection with the European Community. Both organizations, however, created a separate department in their inner structure that focused exclusively with education matters. Their early ’70s publications brought back to the surface a rather forgotten idea in the shape of lifelong learning, and mobility was used as an example of coherent policy for the promotion of lifelong learning. International organizations were the first to realize the importance of education for the future evolution of European integration. As the officials interviewed for this research stated, these organizations illustrated the importance of education to the development of social and political integration. Apart from that contribution it is difficult in the early years to find evidence connecting the development of European education with these two organizations.

Extent of impact on educational policy:

According to officials interviewed for the research, in the early years, external organizations were almost absent in the mobility project. They contributed more in terms of supporting and promoting education rather than being active members and assistants of the European Commission. Therefore, it could be said that in this period only internal institutions impacted on the development of European education. In fact, internal institutions were at that stage assistants of member states in their attempt to make once again education a priority for action, since until then member states as well as institutions, both internal and external, were only concerned with economic development. The influence of external institutions lay only in the impetus provided to European institutions through their publications. In conclusion, institutionalization at that stage was the basic political trend in the European Community and globalization had a slight or imaginary contribution to the development of European education. This is not surprising, given the fact that globalization was at that stage in a rather primary phase of its contemporary existence, while on the other hand internal institutions were trying to build trust with member states, in order to promote European integration.

4.2.3. '1983-1992'

Impact of internal and external institutions:

In this period the Commission without any legal basis and any significant assistance, was forced to restrict proposals concerning the fostering of European citizenship, mainly through mobility policy. Assisted by the ECJ's rulings, the Commission

started becoming more active in education, but it still lacked a legal basis. The ECJ's ruling in the Gravier case was the catalyst for the Commission's 'outbreak'. The ruling in the Gravier case, which connected higher education with vocational training, marked the development of European educational policy since it opened avenues for the Commission to suggest new policies and to promote changes in national educational structures. The cooperation of these two European institutions was the cornerstone for any further development in European education.

In contrast to internal institutions, external institutions during that stage did not play any significant role in the development of European education. Their impact was restrained to some international conferences concerning education.

Extent of impact on educational policy:

The most important aspect in this period is the absence of the external institutions in education. On the one hand, this is strange considering the fact that globalization was already at that stage a powerful political trend. However, it could be suggested that the thrust of globalization at the time was more to do with economic development. In relation to the OECD, for example, their main remit during this period was economic rather than focused on education or other social policy areas.

The story of UNESCO is rather different. After the rebirth of lifelong learning and the contribution of UNESCO to it, European institutions became more proactive, leaving less space for external influences in European matters. This is why UNESCO was forced in a way to withdraw from the European field of education and to be concerned exclusively with non-European issues. At the same time the Commission found an

ally in the ECJ and the institutionalization of European education was extended. European education became a common space for both internal institutions and member states. The great institutionalization of that period had as a result the 'disappearance' of globalization from the field of education while in other political fields globalization had overtaken European institutions.

4.2.4. '1992-1999'

Impact of internal and external institutions:

During this period, the Commission published numerous papers, but it should be acknowledged that concrete policy actions emanating from Commission discussion documents of this nature were small. The actual policy outcomes (or legislative outputs) continued for the most part to be minimal (O'Mahony, 2003). In fact, it is fair to characterize this period of the development of educational policy as being marked by a number of well-meaning resolutions but without real progress being made in terms of actual legislative proposals, until the Bologna Declaration and the Lisbon European Council Summit of 2000. The legislative proposals made and acted upon in this period consisted primarily of decisions (e.g. establishing SOCRATES, LEONARDO and YOUTH Programmes), recommendations, resolutions, communications, objectives and guidelines for future action and not directives¹⁴. This is the great difference between the first and second period.

¹⁴ Community legislation is of four types (Harrop, 1989:3)

- *Regulations* that must be imposed and are directly applicable in the law of all member states.
- *Directives* that are binding as to the ends to be achieved but leave to the national authorities the means of introducing them.
- *Decisions* that are addressed to specific groups, which are binding in their entirety.
- *Recommendations* and *opinions* which have no legal force.

At the same time the contribution of the OECD and UNESCO was not concrete at all, but there was a revival in their interest. In 1996, UNESCO published the significant document *'Learning: The treasure within'*. This was a report which contributed to the already essential discussion on lifelong learning. It proposed once again mobility as a means for further development of European education and as a means for creating a single European education area. In the same year, OECD published *'Education at a glance: OECD indicators'*, which contained statistical analysis for a number of education aspects with mobility being one of the more important.

Extent of impact on educational policy:

What was significant at this stage was the acquisition of a legal basis which contributed to further institutionalization of European education. European institutions were at the forefront of this development but it was clear that globalization sooner or later would affect European education as well as other European policies generally. And, indeed, as will become clear in the examination of the last time period, external institutions are now important co-players in the formation of European education policy.

The revival of interest from external institutions' marked the beginning of a new era in European education. It was now apparent that both member states and internal institutions would never again walk alone in their attempt to create a common European educational area. External institutions realized that they could and should contribute to education, and this contribution became accepted, initially with suspicion.

4.2.5. '1999 - nowadays'

Impact of internal and external institutions:

The Bologna process in 1999 moved the debate on education one step further, with the Bologna Declaration having a major impact on higher education and eventually all levels of education. The project of a European educational space then started to come to the fore. By 1999 member states were more willing to concede some of their national sovereignty in education to the supranational authority, the EU. This was made even more apparent after the 2000 Lisbon Council where the member states set themselves common objectives for 2010. The introduction of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) as a means of achieving the common goals is a good example of the change that has occurred in the mindset of EU states.

The institutionalization of education has been broadened after the Bologna process and the Lisbon Council. The European Council and the European Parliament have been provided with a new role in the process. The Commission is still the main player but it seems to have lost some of its power. In addition, the OMC has created a more open environment in European education, where the member states cooperate more closely and European institutions are mainly promoting this cooperation. This level of cooperation is a result of the Lisbon agenda and specifically the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), which is inspired by economic policy coordination (European Commission, 2004).

With the Bologna process and the implementation of the OMC, the role of the international organizations has altered. After the Bologna process and due to

European expansion, UNESCO ‘received’ again the mandate to promote European education in all these countries to which they did not have access. But the most important achievement concerning external institutions was the gradual convergence, in terms of objectives at least, between the OECD and the European Commission. OECD has evolved as a significant ally of the Commission in its effort to create a concrete educational policy which will lead to the convergence of the member states’ educational systems. OECD’s main contribution lies in the field of statistics. The OECD’s statistical analyses provide the Commission with a useful framework for action. In particular, PISA studies allowed countries to assess their weaknesses and try and improve them. OECD’s benchmarks and indicators are commonly used in the Commission. What was important for the OECD was the benchmarking allowed comparisons between countries, which changed conventional perceptions about which educational system is more productive and why. This development persuaded countries like Germany to reform their systems in order to achieve the required levels of efficiency that OECD has set. Moreover, what is significant for OECD is its relationship with its members, most of which are EU members too. OECD does not have any binding power so it is easier to propose policies for implementation while the Commission is taking advantage of this, using OECD as a chamber to test the reactions of the member states in the proposed policies.

Extent of impact on educational policy:

Both the OECD and UNESCO have become more important players in European education policy after the introduction of the Open Method of Coordination by the Lisbon Council. This method creates a more open environment and promotes closer co-operation. In this context numerous discussion chambers have been created in

which member states, European institutions and international organizations exchange views and opinions concerning European education. From these discussion chambers the member states can benefit in a number of ways: they can learn from another country's experience, they can be advised by the European institutions' experts, and they can take advantage of the international organizations' know-how. According to officials interviewed for the research, this method may potentially persuade member states to accept complete convergence of their national education systems mainly because it is not binding and the member states are acting without any internal or external pressure for the achievement of the agreed strategic target for 2010, which is consolidation. The OMC has provided new impetus to non-binding co-operation, a factor that is most important for member states.

For the first time in the development of European education external organizations have gained an important role. The forces of globalization are now an important co-player in European education as well as in many other policies. European education has entered a new era where decisions are taken with co-operation of the following triptych: member states, European institutions and international organizations. The member states have realized that general co-operation is necessary for the promotion and implementation of a common European educational space. This is partly why they have become more tolerant of external influences while at the same time conceding some responsibilities to European institutions. In fact, education is currently a shared responsibility between a number of European institutions and some external institutions. The Commission remains the most important institution while the Council is now the most important ally of the Commission having replaced the

ECJ, which is still an important institution but without any concrete assistance in education during the last few years.

On the other hand, and in contrary to what happened in previous years, the international organizations have become very active in several fields of educational development. This is mainly the case with the OECD, which is considered today the main external partner in educational policy making. This is significant because the OECD and subsequently UNESCO, have paved the way for more external institutions to become involved in the development of European education.

4.3. Conclusion

In conclusion, the current research suggests that, in terms of education reform, the Commission has played by far the most crucial role. The European Commission was and still is the main institution working for the promotion of European education. The Commission has always carried out a 'surprising amount of educational activity, exercised positive but discreet leadership and, through its sponsorship of pilot projects, spread the word about examples of good educational practice' (Lowe 1992, cited in Murphy 2003). Of course as a DG EAC official says 'any single action of the Commission had to be justified with economic motives, because that was the reason for our existence' (Interview, DG EAC official 4, 23 April 2004).

The influence of the Commission began with the mobility project and its role became more apparent in the third sub period, where it published innumerable documents, mainly White and Green Papers, in relation to common action and coherence in the

European education arena. Today, the Commission has undertaken to achieve the strategic target of 2010, which is for the EU 'to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion' (European Commission, 2002d).

What was important in this research was the prospect of generalizing the findings of the case study to the broader education context. The use of mobility as a case study made feasible the generalization of the findings in relation to the broader context of education. Mobility, once considered to be the only strategic goal and the only action taken, is today just one of thirteen Lisbon objectives and this is indicative of the shift that has occurred in European education. What is also important today in European education is the greater degree of co-operation. The momentum of co-operation has accelerated within the last 4-5 years. While education is, according to the Treaty, the full responsibility of member states, in recent times they have initiated closer co-operation which has resulted in the agreement on a number of common objectives for the education system in Europe. This close co-operation could not have been predicted in previous years and has created greater comparability between member states.

The fact that member states are now comparable has resulted unsurprisingly in greater accountability. This means member states can no longer wholly act on their own in education, instead being 'persuaded' to cede some responsibilities to European institutions, mainly to the Commission. They have also permitted international organizations to influence their educational systems. Of course, institutionalization is

still the main trend concerning European issues in general, and member states appear to have developed a level of trust in European institutions. On the other hand, the influence of globalization and its manifestations cannot be ignored, providing as they have a significant impetus to the rebirth of educational debates. After a long silence they are now again participating, especially the OECD, in the development of European education.

Conclusion

From the silence of the late 1950s and through a long period of transformation European education is today nearer to consolidation. The first period lasted from 1957-1971 and was considered a blank period as far as education policy is concerned. The second period lasted from 1971-1983 and can be termed the foundation-laying period, because at this stage the first coherent attempt at the construction of a European education policy took place. The next period lasted from 1983-1992, and can be termed the expansion period. In this period great achievements were noticed in European education. It was the period that Erasmus, the most significant mobility initiative, began. The period 1992-2000 can be considered to be the main consolidation period, due to the radical change in the perception of education from both member states and European institutions. In this period European education, for the first time, found a legal basis for further development, becoming an Article in the Treaty on European Union. From 2000 until nowadays the momentum of co-operation has been gradually increased year after year and some optimistic officials consider that by the end of 2010 a complete convergence will have been achieved by member states. Some of the more memorable developments of European education and the role of internal and external institutions are outlined below.

The Treaty of Rome in 1957, which marked the inception of the European Community, did not include any direct reference to education. When in the early 1970s international organizations, namely the OECD and UNESCO, brought back to the surface the notion of lifelong learning, the European Community accepted the

necessity of education to the integration project, and the stage was set for a more concerted attempt to establish education in the EU. Almost simultaneously began the discussion on which factors influenced the development of European education. Two main trends were at the fore of this debate: institutionalization and globalization. This discussion has explored a range of European policies (economic, political, social e.t.c.) for the last three decades and has provided a useful paradigm for theoretical debate. These rival approaches have arguments supporting their views but as the research revealed institutionalization has done more for the development of European education. This is mainly because European institutions have a more concrete structure than international organizations and by the time they realized the importance of education they become active mainly via the development of ideas and the proposition of programmes. On the other hand, external influences did not have the power to interfere with member states' policies, attempting instead to foster the notion of education through publications and international conferences.

In 1976 the Council of Europe (in Ministers' of Education level) became the first European institution to publish a coherent document concerning European education. That was the Resolution on Co-operation in Education. This included the eminent Action Programme, which was the first attempt at a common programme and action at the European level. At the same time, international organizations were incapable of influencing in any substantial way. During the same period the establishment of the CEDEFOP (1975) and of the EURYDICE network (1980) provide good examples of the greater degree of institutionalization of European education. In 1985, a ruling from the European Court of Justice (ECJ) changed the face of European education. The ruling in the Gravier case connected higher education with vocational training,

opening a path for the Commission to establish the Erasmus programme. The Erasmus programme concerned the mobility of students, teachers and researchers of higher education. Importantly, every new programme and innovation proposed by the Commission was first tested in higher education and then gradually made its way to other education sectors. To turn back, Erasmus was the beginning of a series of new innovative programmes like TEMPUS and LINGUA, and in 1996 was absorbed by the SOCRATES programme, one of the major achievements of the Commission. Even now Erasmus remains an important educational programme in Europe: more than 2 million students now use Erasmus to study abroad, and Erasmus comprises more than 50% of SOCRATES' total budget.

Concluding the 1980s review, it is worth referring to the 1988 Resolution of the Council of Ministers on the European Dimension in Education. This resolution facilitated the further development of Community programmes, which had as a common goal the promotion of European citizenship and the creation of a common European consciousness. The dawn of the 1990s was marked by the signature in Maastricht of the Treaty on European Union. This Treaty in 1992 underlies the alteration of the perceptions and ideas of both member states and European institutions. It provided the Commission with the necessary legal basis, and proposals and policies were justified on the basis of articles 126 and 127 of the TEU. These articles provided a major impetus to European education and the 'miracle' of the 1990s should be mainly charged to these. It should be said here that in all that period the international organizations remained external spectators without any specific achievement or proposal to display. Their main role was the encouragement of the member states in educational matters and the provision of some international

conferences that acted as chambers for the exchange of views and the sharing of experiences.

Returning back to the ‘miracle’ of the 1990s it could be said that after the Maastricht Treaty, the Commission felt able to become more active in the educational field. That was translated into numerous publications and some initiatives. The 1993 White Paper on ‘Growth, Competitiveness, Employment’ was the first of a series of papers concerning the future of European education. This particular paper was also the first to correlate education with economic growth and it mapped the way for further developments. As a consequence of this paper, in 1995 the Commission published the White Paper on ‘Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society’. This is, indeed, one of the most influential papers in the history of European education and even without having any binding power it provoked numerous changes in education structures of the member states. The next year, 1996, was designated the ‘European Year of Lifelong Learning’, an initiative with unprecedented results. The member states initiated a range of programmes concerning lifelong learning and it was clear that education for the first time in Europe’s history had ‘come in from the cold’. Moreover, the same year witnessed the revival of the active participation of international organizations in European education policy. In particular, in 1996 UNESCO published the ‘Learning: the treasure within’, which concerned the future of European education, referring mainly to lifelong learning. This paper had some impact on the development of European education and it was the beginning of a new era concerning the role of external institutions. In the same year, the OECD published ‘Education at a glance: OECD Indicators’, which marked the initiation of a much closer co-operation between the EU and the OECD.

The co-operation which was initiated in 1996 eventually increased and today the Commission and the OECD co-operate in numerous fields, mainly in the field of statistics. The OECD's indicators as well as its benchmarks are providing the Commission with useful data and are the basis for changes in the structures and the systems of many member states. The PISA studies in 2001, were catalysts for further development of member states, provoking much debate since their results were rather unexpected for some countries (like Germany for example). In any case, after the Bologna process, both globalization specimens obtained a new role in European education, with UNESCO, for instance, being an external observer in the Bologna process, and that became even more apparent after the introduction of the OMC in the Lisbon council. The OMC provided external institutions with the opportunity to become active members in education procedures towards the consolidation and integration of the member states' educational systems. Of course, the OMC promoted, also, further institutionalization giving more responsibilities to the somewhat forgotten (as far as education is concerned) institutions like the European Parliament.

In conclusion, this research generated some significant findings regarding EU education policy. The research suggests that both internal and external institutions have impacted on the development of European educational policy, but to different degrees and not in all time periods. The use of mobility policy as a case study indicated that in the early years, apart from an implied inspiration, external institutions did not have much impact on the development of European education. On the other hand, European institutions, especially the Commission, were at the forefront of developments. The situation has changed in the last few years, as external

institutions have found a place for action in European education while European institutions continue to constitute the principal force of European educational reconstruction. The unprecedented involvement of the OECD in the development of European education has changed the correlations in the political debate between institutionalists and globalists and European educational policy making is now a debate chamber for both internal and external institutions.

Appendix

The interview took place in Brussels at 24 March 2004 and specifically in the EC's Headquarters of the Directorate – General for Education and Culture. Using only four basic questions an attempt was made to clarify as much as possible few certain things, the most important of which was: What was the impact of internal institutions in the development of the European educational policy? Was there any external impact in that development? And if yes what kind of impact was that and in what field? As it will be made clear from the interview transcript apart from the four basic questions several other directed questions were made in order for the goal to be achieved.

Interview transcript¹⁵

M=me, R=respondent.

M: What is your role in the European Union today?

R: I am working in the European Union and specifically in the Education Directorate, which is like an administration. This is responsible for policy issue on education.

M: What is your involvement in the development of the mobility policy?

R: This is an old story. The mobility story goes back to '70s. I was involved in mobility policy but this is totally by accident. What I am doing now is something significantly different. I was in mobility policy 20 years ago. *The mobility policy*

¹⁵ The parts in *italics* are the most important and the analysis part is based on them.

started in 1975. In mid '80s we had the discussion about the first generation of mobility programmes Comet, Erasmus, Linqua and then these became SOCRATES I, SOCRATES II, and now we preparing the next generation of these mobility programmes, which are the most visible important part of education involvement in the EU context but it is no longer the only one. What is really new is that promotion of mobility used to be the only important of the EU in education and now we moved to a totally different stage where mobility is a very important part but definitely not longer the only part, due to Education 2010 which is part of the Lisbon strategy. This whole new policy agenda goes beyond mobility, and mobility is one of the objectives of Lisbon.

M: Which were the main reasons for the development of the mobility policies in the early '70s?

R: *It started because the citizens' education would be an area where the EU could provide added value. They were very small scale initiatives, for example to foster joint programmes between institutions that would jointly designed schemes to exchange students and teachers. For those exchanges the EU could provide some funding not without resistance right from the beginning. And then a new avenue opened. There was a ruling by the Court of Justice at the basis of everything EU has done later on lies on rulings and judgements and decisions by the ECJ: the Gravier case. Because the Gravier said Higher Education is in essence professional education because it is a condition to access to professional activity. There was a new door opened. [...] So in the beginning was mobility. The main mean of the Erasmus programme was motivation to bring closer the systems of Higher Education, to make them more familiar to each other. Allow in that way a number of European citizens*

direct experience in another EU country as they go there to study. So it was really the so called citizenship which lay behind this economic aspect were marginal in those days. In Lisbon agenda it is the other way around. Economic and social aspects are dominant. Of course there is also the citizenship aspect but the main rational is economy, the knowledge based economy and the contribution that has to make to social integration, to economy, to the development of a human as a whole, it is a much more global agenda.

M: Do the International organizations, such as the OECD and UNESCO, have any impact in the development of European educational policy in general?

R: *UNESCO very very little.* UNESCO produces ideas, indications and that is important but in most cases their analysis consult with our own analysis so there is no contradiction but I do not think that UNESCO has really had a traceable influence on what EU has been doing neither in Higher Education nor in education in general. *This does not mean that it is neglected.* Just means that I do not think that has made a significant difference, because their analysis consults with ours. OECD has probably in a way contributed to making EU agenda more acceptable, because OECD itself has its own agenda in education. *So we work together with OECD.* They have contributed making countries wake up to their deficiencies with PISA's studies. *I think the deepest influence OECD has had is through the impact of the PISA studies, which revealed to countries that were basically convinced that they were good.* And they did not know exactly why. And then OECD appeared showing countries like Germany that they were not good at all. Their quality was mediocre but also the system was very inequalitarian, when they thought they were excellent. So there OECD has sort of created favourite conditions for development of more proactive programmes like

ours. As OECD basically makes analysis, it says there is a problem there, it does not really pull together the agent of country and say “ok now we are going to address these problems jointly”.

M: So, at last, do you think that was there any impact from the International Organizations?

R: *I do not think so but maybe there was in the heads of those who in that stage had ideas for an agenda in education for the EU. Maybe they read and were aware of these reports (OECD's and UNESCO's first reports) and all that. I can not exclude it. What I know for certain is that as soon as we started preparing the real programmes, SOCRATES and all these things, there was no influence either from OECD or from UNESCO, for quite simple reason that you cannot compare OECD, UNESCO and EU. They are completely different organizations. OECD is a grouping of countries, the EU has an agenda for much more integration and you cannot even compare the means or the structures of these organizations. EU is not an international organization. It is much more than that.*

M: What about globalization? Does this political trend have any influence in the mobility issue?

R: *Well yes. Because it is part of life, it is part of the political, economic, social, culture situation today. And of course the programmes had been adapted to these realities and in particular the new agenda of the Lisbon. Globalization has a direct impact in setting the Lisbon agenda making Europe more competitive on the world wide stage which was not really a part of the original agenda which was much more European. What it is really new in the Lisbon agenda, and this is also new in the*

education agenda, is been the external sight. So the Lisbon says that EU needs to become more competitive, in respect to the US, Japan and the other parts of the world. It says that EU needs to increase its capacity to function effectively in the knowledge society, in globalised knowledge society and economy and has ambitions to become a leader in the modern era.

M: In the early years the European educational policy was a rather internal issue and it was mainly concerning Higher education, is not that right?

R: Yes, that is right. The agenda for mobility first was only concerning Higher education. You see in the history every new move in the EU, in the area of education, started in Higher education. Joint study programmes were (concerned) Higher education, Erasmus was (concerned) Higher education. Later on only when we started the SOCRATES programme the programmes did go beyond Higher education including secondary education, primary education etc.

M: What about the division of the periods of European education? Do you believe that one could separate the European educational history into periods?

R: *I think that there are two stages. One started in 1975 and lasted until 1999. And it was mobility; it always started in Higher education then spread over into other levels of education. And it was intra. Intra-small EU in 1975, intra-the slightly enlarged EU in 1985, intra-European (in the case of TEMPUS), intra-west European and then it was intra-EU. So the first generation is Higher education, is mobility and it was intra-EU or Europe. The new agenda is much more open and [also the first agenda was only mobility and by this I mean mobility without any changes in structures] more policy and reform oriented. It started with the Bologna process again in Higher*

education. But what does the Bologna process concerns? At first, it sets common goals for 2010, not by accident so there are common goals. There were common goals before but now common goals to achieve an integrated area within a competitive area in respect to the outside world. So the Bologna declaration is the first document that refers to external aspects of policy and reforms and is the first one which refers to the external dimensions. Because basically it says we need to build up a compatibility within the EU, because without compatibility we will not be able to reap all the benefits of being all members of EU.

M: What about the contribution of the external organizations to this agenda?

R: No again. We maintain contacts mainly with OECD. OECD has an agenda which is totally autonomous. *The main contribution to what we do is through data. They provide interesting statistical data. Some analysis of this data is used to build up our policy agenda. But there is not a concrete policy agenda within the OECD, for the simple reason that they have no legitimacy to do it. We have considerable respect for the quality of the work done by the OECD. They could not have developed policy agenda in the same way as the EU, because they are not a Community.*

What I would like finally to say is that mobility is and will remain very important but next to it for supporting it but definitely going beyond mobility is the policy agenda about convergence, coherence, compatibility and competitiveness, attractiveness.

M: I would really like to thank you very much for your cooperation and the considerable amount of time you spent with me.

R: It was my pleasure and I hope you will find my remarks useful.

References

- Alter, K. (1996) The European Court's political power, in *West European Politics*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 458-487.
- Alter, K. (1998) Who are the 'Masters of the Treaty'? European governments and the European Court of Justice, in *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 121-147.
- Angus, L. (2004) Globalization and educational change: bringing about the reshaping and re-norming of practice, in *Journal of Educational Policy*, Vol. 19, No. 1, January 2004, 23- 41.
- Asgeirsdottir, B. (2003) *A systemic approach to co-finance Lifelong learning*, Speech delivered to the International Policy Conference, 8-10 October.
- Bell, J. (1999) *Doing your research project*, Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.
- Bhola, H.S. (1988) *World trends and issues in adult education*, UNESCO publishing.
- Bologna Declaration, (1999) *The European Higher Education Area – Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education*, Convened in Bologna on 19 June 1999.
- Borg, C. & Mayo, P. (2005) The EU Memorandum on lifelong learning. Old wine in new bottles?, in *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2. July 2005, 203-225.
- Bücherl, W. (1998) Responsive governance in a globalizing world, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving*

- Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 95-97.
- Chisholm, L. (1998) Education is more: The momentum for reform, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 87-92.
- Coffield, F. (1999) Breaking the Consensus: lifelong learning as social control, in *British Educational Research Journal*, VOL. 25, N. 4, 1999, 479-499.
- Cohen, L. et al (2001) *Research Methods in Education*, RoutledgeFalmer, London.
- Coulby, D. (2004) Globalization and Education, paper presented at the *European Conference on Education Research*, University of Crete, 22-25 September 2004.
- Council of Europe, (1970) *Permanent Education*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe, (1977) *Contents and Methods of Adult Education*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe, (1978) *Permanent Education: Final Report*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.
- Dale, R. (1999) Specifying globalization effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms, in *Journal of Educational Policy*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1-17.
- Dale, R. (2005) Globalization, knowledge economy and comparative education, in *Comparative Education*, Vol. 41, No. 2, May 2005, 117-149.
- Delors, J. J. (1996) *Learning: The Treasure Within*. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty- first Century/ Highlights. Paris, UNESCO publishing.

- Demeulemeester, J.L and Rochat, D., (2001) The European policy regarding education and training: A critical assessment, in *SKOPE Research Paper* No.21, Autumn 2001, Oxford and Warwick Universities.
- Dicken, P. (2003) *Global Shift: Reshaping the global economic map in the 21st century*, SAGE publications, London.
- Dimitrakopoulos, D. (2001), Unintended Consequences: Institutional Autonomy and Executive Discretion in the European Union, in *Journal of Public policy*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 107-131.
- European Commission (1991) *Memorandum on higher education in the European Community*, Luxembourg.
- European Commission (1993) *White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment: The Challenges and Ways Forward into the 21st century*, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commission (1995) *White Paper: Teaching and Learning. Towards the Learning Society*. Brussels: ed. E. C./ Directorate General Education. Training and Young.
- European Commission (1996a) *Green Paper on the European dimension of education*, Office for Official Publications, Luxembourg.
- European Commission (1996b) *Learning in the information society; action plan for a European education initiative, 1996-98*, Communication from the Commission, Luxembourg.
- European Commission (1996c) *Accomplishing Europe through education and training*, Report of Study Group on Education and Training, Brussels.
- European Commission (1996d) *Green Paper: Education-training-research; the obstacles to trans-national mobility*, Luxembourg.

European Commission (1997) *Towards a Europe of knowledge*, Communication from the Commission, Luxembourg.

European Commission (1999) *Implementation of the White Paper "Teaching and Learning. Towards the learning society"*. Report from the Commission, Luxembourg.

European Commission (1999) *Young People's training. Key Data on Vocational Training in the European Union*. Brussels : European Commission. Education & Culture, EUROSTAT & CEDEFOP.

European Commission (2000) *Final Commission report on the implementation of the SOCRATES Programme 1995 – 1999*, Brussels.

European Commission (2001) *Memorandum: making a European Area of lifelong learning a reality*. Brussels: E.C..

European Commission (2002a) *A European area of Lifelong learning*, Directorate General for Education, Luxembourg.

European Commission (2002b) *Making lifelong learning a reality for all*, Luxembourg.

European Commission (2002c) *SOCRATES: Gateway to education*, Directorate General for Education, Brussels.

European Commission, (2002d) *The future development of the European Union. Education, Training and Youth programmes after 2006*, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Brussels.

European Commission (2002e) *European report on quality indicators of Lifelong learning*, Brussels.

European Commission (2002f) *Education and training in Europe: diverse systems, shared goals for 2010*, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Luxembourg.

European Commission (2004) *Progress towards the common objectives in education and training: Indicators and Benchmarks*, Brussels.

European Council (1976) *Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council comprising an action programme in the field of education*, (O.J. No C 38, 19.02.1976, p.1)

Faure, E. (1972) *Learning to Be: The world of Education Today and Tomorrow*, Paris, UNESCO.

Field, J. (1994) *Educational and Vocational Training Policy*, London: Longmans/Spicers European Union Policy Briefings.

Field, J. (1997) The European Union and the Learning Society: Contested Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization, in Coffield, Frank (Ed) *A National Strategy for LLL*, Department of Education, University of Newcastle, ISBN 0 7017 0076 9.

Field, J. (2001) Lifelong education, in *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, Vol. 20, NO.1/2, (January-April), 3-15.

Field, J. (2002) Building a European Dimension: a realistic response to globalization?, in *Promoting European dimensions in lifelong learning*, ed. by Field, J., NIACE, 2002.

Fortuny, M. (1998) Globalization and social governance: the employment challenge, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 105-108.

- Gelpi, E. (1985) *Lifelong education and international relations*, London, Groom Helm.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Gray, J. (2002) *False Dawn: The delusions of global capitalism*, London, Granta Books.
- Green, A. (2002) The many faces of lifelong learning: recent education policy trends in Europe, in *Journal of Education Policy*, VOL. 17, NO. 6, 611-626.
- Hake, J. B. (1999) Lifelong Learning in Late Modernity: The Challenges to Society, Organizations, and Individuals, in *Adult Education Quarterly*, VOL. 49, N. 2, Winter 1999, 79-90.
- Hasan, A. (1999) Lifelong-learning: implications for education policy, in *Lifelong Learning Policy and Research*, ed. by Tuijnman and Schuller, VOL. 75, 51-62.
- Harrop, J. (1989) *The political economy of integration in the European Community*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar.
- Held, D. and McGrew, A.G. (1999) *Global Transformations*, Cambridge.
- Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2000) *The global transformations reader: an introduction to the globalization debate*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hingel, A. (2001) Educational policies and European governance-contribution to the interservice groups of European governance, in *European Journal for Educational Law and Policy*, 5: 7-16, 2001.
- International Labour Organization (2000) *Lifelong learning in the Twenty First century: The changing roles of Educational Personnel*, International Labour Office, Geneva, 10-14 April, 2000.

- Jansen, T. & Bücherl, W. (1998) Globalization and social governance in Europe and the US, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, Preface.
- Jarboe, K. (1998) Globalization: One world, two versions, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 11-20.
- Jarvis, P. (1999) Global Trends in Lifelong Learning and the Response of the Universities, in *Comparative Education*, Vol. 35, No. 2 1999, 249-257.
- Jones, P. (1998) Globalization and Internationalism: democratic prospects for world education, in *Comparative Education*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 143-155.
- Lehmann, W. & Schunz, S. (2005) Anticipating the European Constitution: Parliamentarization or Re-nationalization?, in panel 10F *The European Parliament One Year After the Enlargement*, Saturday, 2 April, 10:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
- Little, R. and Smith M. (1991) *Perspectives on world politics*, London, Routledge.
- Longworth, N. (2003) *Lifelong learning in action: transforming education for the 21st century*, London, Sterling, Va.: Kogan Page.
- Mancini, G. (1998) Europe: the case for statehood, *European Law Journal*, 4 (1), 29-42.
- Marginson, S. (1999) After globalization: emerging politics of education, in *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 19-31.

- Martin, J. (2001) *Adult learning at the OECD – Will Cinderella get to the ball?*
Speech delivered to the International Conference on Adult Learning Policies,
Seoul, Korea, 5-7 December.
- Moravcsik, A. (1991) Negotiating the Single European Act: national interests and
conventional statecraft in the European Community, in O'Neill, M. (ed.) *The
politics of European integration: A Reader*, London, Routledge.
- Moravcsik, A. (1993) Preferences and power in the European Community: a liberal
intergovernmentalist approach, in O'Neill, M. (ed.) *The politics of European
integration: A Reader*, London, Routledge.
- Murphy, M. (2000) Adult Education, Lifelong learning and the End of Political
Economy, in *Studies in the Education of Adults*, VOL. 32, N. 2, October 2000,
166-180.
- Murphy, M. (2003) Covert Action? Education, social policy and law in the European
Union, in *Journal of Educational Policy*, September-October 2003, Vol. 18,
No. 5, 551-562.
- NIACE, (2003) *Lifelong learning in a change continent: continued education in the
universities of Europe*, ed. by Osborne, M. – Edward, T., Leicester, National
Institute of Adult Continuing Education.
- Nisbet, J and Watt, J. (1984) Case study, in J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey and S.
Goulding (eds), *Conducting Small-scale Investigations in Educational
Management*, London, Harper & Row, 79-92.
- Novoa, A. (2000) Europe and Education: Historical and Comparative Approaches, in
J. Bouzakis (ed) *Historical-Comparative Perspectives*, Athens, Gutenberg.
- OECD (1966) *Modernizing our schools: Curriculum improvement and educational
development*, Paris.

- OECD (1971) *Educational Policies for the 1970's*, Paris.
- OECD (1972) *The nature of the curriculum for the eighties and onwards*, Paris.
- OECD (1996) *Making Lifelong Learning a Reality for All*, Paris.
- OECD (1996) *Education at a glance: OECD Indicators 1996 Edition*.
- OECD (1996) *Education at a glance: Analysis*.
- OECD (c1996) *Lifelong Learning for All*, Paris.
- OECD (c2000) *Motivating students for Lifelong learning*, Paris.
- OECD (2000) *Where are the Resources for Lifelong Learning?* Paris.
- OECD (2001) *Economics and Finance of Lifelong Learning*, Paris.
- OECD (2001) *Knowledge and skills for life – First results from PISA 2000*,
Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA, Paris.
- OECD (2002) *Financing Education: Investments and Returns: Analysis of the World
Education Indicators 2002 Edition*
- OECD (2002) *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2002 Edition*.
- OECD (c2003) *Beyond Rhetoric: Adult Learning Policies and Practices*, Paris.
- Official Journal of the European Communities (2000), Decision No 253/2000/EC of
the European Parliament and of the Council of January 2000: *establishing the
second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education
'Socrates'*.
- Olssen, M. (2004) Neoliberalism, globalization, democracy: challenges for education,
in *Globalization, Societies and Education*, Vol. 2, No. 2, July 2004, 231-275.
- O'Mahony, J. (2003) *Education Policy in the European Union – a 'poor relation'?*,
Dublin European Institute, September 2003.
- O'Neill, M. (1996) *The politics of European Integration: A reader*, London,
Routledge.

- Papadopoulos, G. (2003) Policies for lifelong learning: an overview of international trends, in OECD *Beyond Rhetoric: Adult learning policies and practices*, Paris.
- Pollack, M. (2000) The End of Creeping Competence? EU Policy-Making Since Maastricht, in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 519-538.
- Risse, T. (1999) Approaches to the Study of European Politics, forum in the *ECSA Review*, Spring 1999 (XII: 2), 2-9.
- Rizvi, F. (2004) Debating globalization and education after September 11, in *Comparative Education*, Vol. 40, No. 2, May 2004, 157-171.
- Sachwald, F. (1998) Sustainable globalization, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 117-120.
- Scharpf, F. (1999) Approaches to the Study of European Politics, forum in the *ECSA Review*, Spring 1999 (XII: 2), 2-9.
- Schmidt, S. (2000) Only an agenda setter? The European Commission's power over the Council of Ministers, in *European Union Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 37-61.
- Schmidt, V. (1999) Approaches to the Study of European Politics, forum in the *ECSA Review*, Spring 1999 (XII: 2), 2-9.
- Shaw, JO. (1999) 'From the Margins to the Centre: Education and Training Law and Policy', in Paul Craig and Grainne de Burca, *From the Margins to the Centre: Education and Training Law and Policy*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Smith, A. (1992) National identities and the idea of European unity, in *The politics of European Integration: A reader*, London, Routledge.
- Smith, M. (2001) Diplomacy by Decree: The Legalization of EU Foreign Policy, in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 79-104.

- Sprokkereef, A. (1992) Developments in European Community Education Policy, In Juliet Lodge. Ed. *The European Community and the challenge of the future*, Second edition, Pinter, London.
- Spring, J. (1998) *Education and the rise of the global economy*, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Strathdee, R. (2005) Globalization, innovation, and the declining significance of qualifications led social and economic change, in *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 4, July 2005, 437-456.
- Sukalac, K. (1998) Globalization and social governance in Europe and the US, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 103-104.
- Tallberg, J. (2000) The Anatomy of Autonomy: An Institutional Account of Variation in Supranational Influence, in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 5, 843-864.
- Telo, M. (1998) Globalization and social governance in Europe and the US, presented at *Globalization and Social Governance in Europe and the US: Improving Responsiveness to International Change Project Round Table*, Brussels, 19/20 November 1998, 21-28.
- Tsebelis, G. (1999) Approaches to the Study of European Politics, forum in the *ECSA Review*, Spring 1999 (XII: 2), 2-9.
- Tuijnman, A. & Schuller, T. (1999) Lifelong Learning Policy and Research, Proceedings of an International Symposium, ed. by Tuijnman and Schuller, VOL. 75.

Tuijnman, A & Bostrom, A. K. (2002) Changing notions of lifelong education and lifelong learning, in *International Review of Education*, Vol. 48, No. 1/2, 93-110.

UNESCO (1974) *Educational in a rural environment*, Belgium.

UNESCO (1975) *Education on the move-A companion volume to Learning to Be*, Paris-Canada.

UNESCO (1976) *Foundations of Lifelong Learning*, Ed. By Dave, R.H., UNESCO Institute for Education, Pergamon Press.

UNESCO (1995) International Institute For Educational Planning. *Major Programme I: Towards lifelong learning for All (28C/5- II.A)*. Paris: UNESCO publishing.

UNESCO (1995) *Policy paper for change and development in Higher education*, Paris: UNESCO publishing.

UNESCO (1996) *Higher education in the 21st century. A student perspective*, Paris.

UNESCO (1998) *Higher education in the Twenty-first century: Vision and action*, Final report of the World Conference on Higher Education, Paris 5-9 October 1998.

UNESCO (2000) *Partnership in action: UNESCO's educational activities in the Europe region*, UNESCO, Education Sector, September 2000, Paris.

UNESCO (2000) *Accountability and International Co-operation in the Renewal of Higher Education*, Paris, UNESCO publishing.

UNESCO (2001) *Revisiting Lifelong Learning for the 21st Century*, UNESCO Institute for Education, Philippines.

UNESCO (2002) *Learning throughout life: challenges for the 21st century*, UNESCO publishing.

Van Waarden F, and Drahos, M. (2002) Courts and (epistemic) communities in the convergence of competition policies, in *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 6, 913-934.

Wall, W.D. (1977) *Constructive education for adolescents*, G. Harrap and UNESCO, London.

Whitehead, M. (2000) *Educational policy and the European Union: An introduction*, Hull, Eurotext Project.

Yin, R.K. (1984) *Case study research: Design and methods*, Newbury Park, CA, Sage.

URLs

- www.oecd.org
- www.uie.org
- www.unesco.org
- <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/life/communication/com.en.pdf>
- <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/sector/techmeet/jmep2000/jmepr1.htm>
- <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11047.htm>
- http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates_en.html